



Approaching the Roman Revolution

PAPERS ON REPUBLICAN HISTORY

Sir Ronald Syme

Edited by Federico Santangelo

OXFORD



VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

APPROACHING THE ROMAN REVOLUTION



Sir Ronald Syme, Berkeley, 1959/1960

Approaching the Roman Revolution

Papers on Republican History

SIR RONALD SYME

Edited by
FEDERICO SANTANGELO

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Introduction, Compilation, and Addenda Federico Santangelo.
Chapters 1 to 26 the Estate of the Late Sir Ronald Syme 2016

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2016

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016936385

ISBN 978-0-19-876706-0

Printed in Great Britain by
Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>Editorial Notes</i>	xiii
Editor's Introduction	1
1. The Divorce of Aemilius Paullus	16
2. The Predominance of the Fulvii	26
3. The Politics of the Marcii	44
4. The Abdication of Sulla	56
5. The Speech for Roscius of Ameria	79
6. M. Aemilius Lepidus (<i>cos.</i> 78 BC)	93
7. Satellites of Sulla	111
8. The Unspeakable Fufidius	119
9. <i>Rex Leptasta</i> (<i>Hist.</i> II, 20)	122
10. Sallust and Bestia	128
11. Rome and Arpinum	137
12. The Consular Elections, 70–66 BC	140
13. Catilina's Three Marriages	154
14. Crassus, Catilina, and the Vestal Virgins	158
15. Sallust on Crassus	162
16. Sallust's List of Conspirators	166
17. P. Sulla (<i>cos. cand.</i> 66 BC)	169
18. The Gay Sempronia	173
19. The End of the Fulvii	182
20. Caesar as <i>Pontifex Maximus</i>	186
21. Cicero's Change of Plan (August 7, 44 BC)	196
22. Nicolaus of Damascus XXVIII and XXXI	206

23. Virgil's First Patron	212
24. Caesar and Augustus in Virgil	230
25. How Many <i>Fasces</i> ?	255
26. Rome and Umbria	272
Bibliographical Addenda	339
<i>Bibliography</i>	383
<i>General Index</i>	397
<i>Primary Sources</i>	412

Acknowledgements

It is a great pleasure to express my thanks for the advice, support, and encouragement I have received from many sources while working on this volume.

Anthony Birley alerted me to the existence of the papers in the Syme *Nachlass*, shared with me the transcriptions of several pieces on which he had been working in the 1990s, commented on a draft of the introduction, provided advice on matters large and small throughout the unfolding of the project, and generously offered to go through the proofs. Sir Fergus Millar, Syme's literary executor, kindly granted me permission to access and conduct research on the Syme Papers, was very supportive of my work from its inception, and suggested the title of this collection. Without the interest and involvement of those two former pupils and friends of Ronald Syme, this book could not have possibly taken shape.

I am very grateful to Glen Bowersock for the encouragement and advice he offered me since the inception of the project. William Harris and Mark Toher provided valuable factual information on specific aspects of the Syme Archive. Christopher Smith, Marco Buonocore, and Arnaldo Marcone gave me the chance to present some aspects of my ongoing work at a colloquium they organised at the British School at Rome in April 2014. Chris Pelling kindly shared with me the text of his 2014 Syme Lecture on the rhetoric of *The Roman Revolution*. I have benefited from discussion of specific points with Luciano Canfora, Luca Fezzi, Gustavo Alberto García Vivas, Leandro Polverini, Rowland Smith, and Giusto Traina.

Oliver House at Special Collections, Bodleian Library went well beyond the call of duty in guiding me through the body of the Syme Papers at an early stage of my research. I am grateful to Ellen Rice and Liz Baird at Wolfson College Archive for alerting me to the existence of recently discovered papers on Greek history topics. Mike White at Lincoln College, Oxford offered much-needed IT support at a crucial junction. Syme's portrait is here reproduced with the permission of The Regents of the University of California, UC Berkeley.

I was very fortunate to find in Patrick Tansey a reader that was as tremendously knowledgeable as he was unfailingly generous. I am deeply grateful to Alberto Dalla Rosa, who has offered an invaluable set of suggestions on *fascēs* and on Syme's place in the modern scholarly debate on *imperium*, and to John Rich, who commented on early drafts of the addenda to the papers on Sempronia and Caesar's pontificate, and offered insightful advice on a number of editorial issues. Alex Nice, James Richardson, Alexander Thein, and Frederik Vervaet have read the typescript or parts of it, and have made important suggestions on the framing of the addenda.

Fiona Noble provided invaluable editorial support. I am very grateful to the School of History, Classics and Archaeology of Newcastle University for funding her work.

At Oxford University Press Hilary O'Shea and Charlotte Loveridge have been unfailingly supportive throughout the process. I have much profited from the comments of three Press referees, which proved crucial in enabling me to define the scope and remit of this edition at an early stage. Clare Kennedy, Georgina Leighton, Phil Dines, and Lydia Shinoj have seen the book through production with tremendous helpfulness.

My oldest debt, and one that I recall with especially fond gratitude, is to the late Celeste Locatelli (1924–2001), who taught Italian, Greek, and Latin at the Liceo Classico in Savona (Liguria, north-west Italy) for over two decades, kept lecturing and taking a keen interest in young people's education well into his retirement, and once told my seventeen-year-old self that reading '*La Rivoluzione romana* del Syme' would be a good idea.

Abbreviations

AE	<i>L'Année Épigraphique</i> , Paris 1888–.
BMCR	H. A. Grueber, <i>Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum</i> , 3 vols, London 1910.
CIA	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum</i> , Berlin 1873–1897.
CIG	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , Berlin 1828–1877.
CIL	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i> , Berlin 1863–.
CPL	R. Cavenaile (ed.), <i>Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum</i> , Wiesbaden 1956–1958.
FRHist	T. J. Cornell (ed.), <i>The Fragments of the Roman Historians</i> , Oxford 2013.
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> , Berlin 1895–.
IRRP	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes</i> , Paris 1901–1927.
Inscr. It.	<i>Inscriptiones Italiae</i> , Rome 1931–.
ILS	H. Dessau (ed.), <i>Inscriptiones Latinae selectae</i> , Berlin 1892–1916.
Mommsen, RF	T. Mommsen, <i>Römische Forschungen</i> , 2 vols., Berlin 1864–1879.
MRR	T. R. S. Broughton, <i>The Magistrates of the Roman Republic</i> , 3 vols., New York 1951–1960.
Münzer, RA	F. Münzer, <i>Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien</i> , Stuttgart 1920.
Münzer, KS	F. Münzer, <i>Kleine Schriften</i> , eds. M. Haake and A.-C. Harders, Stuttgart 2012.
RE	G. Wissowa et al. (eds.), <i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , Stuttgart 1893–1978.
RRC	M. H. Crawford, <i>Roman Republican Coinage</i> , Cambridge 1974.
SIG ³	H. Dittenberger, <i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , 3rd ed., Leipzig 1915–1924.
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> , Leiden 1923–.
Sydenham, RRC	E. A. Sydenham, <i>The Coinage of the Roman Republic</i> , revised with indexes by G. C. Haines, eds. L. Forrer and C. A. Hersh, London 1952.
Syme, AA	R. Syme, <i>The Augustan Aristocracy</i> , Oxford 1986.
Syme, RP	R. Syme, <i>Roman Papers</i> , I–VII, Oxford 1979–1991.
Syme, RR	R. Syme, <i>The Roman Revolution</i> , Oxford 1939.
Syme, Sallust	R. Syme, <i>Sallust</i> , Berkeley-Los Angeles-Cambridge 1964.

All abbreviations of journals follow *L'Année Philologique*.

Editorial Notes

1. **The Divorce of Aemilius Paullus:** a typescript of the text with handwritten corrections by S. (thirteen pages) survives in Syme Papers (Special Collections, Bodleian Library, Oxford), Box 11/1, along with an identical copy; it offers no clues as to its possible dating. An ostensibly later copy is in Syme 10/1. The manuscript of a full set of notes (five pages) also survives in 11/1, along with a photocopy.
2. **The Predominance of the Fulvii:** a very deteriorated typescript (twenty-two pages) of the text and a handwritten set of notes (five pages) survive in Syme 11/1. They do not provide specific clues about their dating. An ostensibly later typescript and a photocopy of the set of notes also survive in the same box.
3. **The Politics of the Marcii:** the text survives in two undated typescripts of thirteen and seventeen pages respectively (Box 10/1). There are no significant discrepancies between the two versions; the pagination given here follows that of the typescript that appears to be earlier, which also has a set of references handwritten by S. himself. Two copies of the seventeen-page typescript also survive in Syme 11/1. A complete set of notes (six pages) survives in Syme 11/1, along with a photocopy. The sequence of notes has been slightly altered for the purposes of this edition.
4. **The Abdication of Sulla:** a pencil-written manuscript in Syme 11/3, on the back of circulars dating to May 1945. Forty-nine pages of text and twenty of notes.
5. **The Speech for Roscius of Ameria:** a pencil-written manuscript in Syme 11/3; twenty-nine pages of text and eleven of notes.
6. **M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 78 BC):** a pencil-written manuscript of forty-eight pages in Syme 11/3.
7. **Satellites of Sulla:** a manuscript of sixteen pages, written on the back of headed paper of the 'Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines, Président C. Hoeg, Secrétaire Général R. Syme' (i.e. post-1955) and a typescript with handwritten corrections and annotations by Syme (thirteen pages) survive in Syme 11/5. In the same box there is another copy of the typescript, and a third copy is split between Syme 11/5 (pp. 1–5) and Syme 11/1 (pp. 6–13). The footnotes have been compiled on the basis of S.'s annotations in the margins of a typescript.
8. **The Unspeakable Fufidius:** two identical typescripts in Syme 11/5; two copies of another typescript of three pages in Syme 10/1. Manuscript of four pages with notes in the margins in Syme 10/1 (it is written on the back of headed paper of the Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines, *terminus post quem* 1955, cf. no. 7). The notes are based on S.'s annotations on the manuscript and on parts of the typescript.

9. **Rex Leptasta:** seven pages of typescript in Syme 10/1; an identical typescript in Syme 11/1, with note numbers added by S.; six pages of handwritten notes in Syme 11/1.
10. **Sallust and Bestia:** eleven pages of typescript in Syme 10/1, 11/2, and 11/5 (three identical copies); eight pages of handwritten notes in 11/5. A manuscript of sixteen pages also survives in the same box.
11. **Rome and Arpinum:** three pages of typescript of the text in Syme 10/1 (two copies), 11/2, and 11/5; a manuscript of five pages also survives in Syme 10/1, including some annotations in the margins that form the basis of the notes in this edition (on the same headed paper on which the manuscript of 'The Unspeakable Fufidius' was written).
12. **The Consular Elections, 70–66 BC:** eighteen pages of typescript in Syme 10/1 and 11/5; no manuscript and no footnotes survive.
13. **Catilina's Three Marriages:** four pages of typescript in Syme 10/1 (two copies), 11/2 and 11/5; no notes survive. A manuscript of six pages also survives in Syme 6/2; it has some annotations by S. in the margins, which have been used as a base for the footnotes in this edition.
14. **Crassus, Catilina, and the Vestal Virgins:** a manuscript of seven pages with some marginal annotations (on which the notes in this edition are based) survives in Syme 11/5; page 4 is written on the back of an account sheet dated 31.12.1961 and page 5 on the back of a College paper dated January 1962.
15. **Sallust on Crassus:** a manuscript of eight pages survives in Syme 11/5; page 3 is written on the back of the minutes of a meeting that took place on 12.03.1962. There are some annotations in the margins, which have provided the base for the footnotes.
16. **Sallust's List of Conspirators:** a manuscript of four pages with some marginal annotations in Syme 11/5. Page 1 is written on the back of a reference letter dated 26.10.1961.
17. **P. Sulla (*cos. cand.* 66):** five pages of typescript in Syme 11/1 and 11/2, the latter being a more advanced version; a manuscript and several slips and brief notes in Syme 11/1.
18. **The Gay Sempronia:** In Syme 11/2 survive eleven pages of typescript of the main text, in two sets, both with handwritten corrections by S. This edition gives the page breaks of the typescript that has notes numbers on it. The same box also contains eleven pages of manuscript, followed by six pages of handwritten notes, in one set. A photocopy of both is in the same box.
19. **The End of the Fulvii:** five pages of typescript in Syme 11/2. An earlier, undated typescript of five pages also survives in Syme 11/2. Three pages of handwritten notes survive in the same box.

20. **Caesar as *Pontifex Maximus***: ten pages of typescript of the text in Syme 10/1, 11/1 and 11/2; five pages of handwritten notes in Syme 11/2. No manuscript of the main text survives. Some index slips on the topic in Syme 10/2.
21. **Cicero's Change of Plan (August 7, 44 BC)**: twenty-six pages of manuscript of the main text and six of notes in Syme 11/2, as well as a typescript of fourteen pages.
22. **Nicolaus of Damascus XXVIII and XXXI**: a manuscript of eighteen pages (fourteen of text and four of notes, continuously numbered) survives in Syme 11/2. It contains no hints regarding its dating; since there are no references to *RR*, it is very likely to be pre-1939.
23. **Virgil's First Patron**: a typescript of twenty-nine pages with handwritten annotations by S. in Syme 11/2, along with a manuscript of the notes (four pages, one of which is written on the back of a circular dated 15.03.43).
24. **Caesar and Augustus in Virgil**: the text is written on thirty-two pages of typescript in Syme 11/2 and 11/4; thirty-six pages of manuscript, followed by six pages of handwritten notes, in 11/2. Also noteworthy, in the same box, six pages of notes on modern studies on Virgil, one of which is written on the back of a circular produced after May 1943.
25. **How Many *Fasces*?**: two identical typescripts of twenty-three pages survive in 11/3 and 11/4. S.'s handwritten annotations in the margins of one copy have been used as the base for the footnotes in this edition.
26. **Rome and Umbria**: a typescript and a set of handwritten notes survive in Syme 6/3; the pages are not continuously numbered; each chapter has its own sequence. Two different versions of 'The *pietas* of Calvisius Sabinus' survive: one of twenty-three pages, without annotations, and one of sixteen pages, from which pp. 4, 5, and 15 are missing, which is densely annotated and followed by a manuscript of notes (seven pages). The text published here is based on the latter version, supplemented as appropriate on the basis of the other typescript.

Editor's Introduction

When Sir Ronald Syme died, on 4th September 1989, aged eighty-six, he was still a remarkably active scholar.¹ In the previous May he had presented a paper at the *Historia Augusta* Colloquium at Maria-Laach. Several handwritten lists that were found among his papers show that in the second half of the 1980s, and even as late as 1989, he was prepared to offer lectures on about three dozen historical topics.² Several papers that were published in 1991 in the sixth instalment of *Roman Papers* had not yet appeared in the proceedings volumes for which they were originally intended, and *RP* VII consists entirely of previously unpublished contributions, most of which had originally been intended for a volume on 'Pliny and Italia Transpadana'.³ *RP* VI–VII appeared posthumously, but was fully planned and designed by Syme himself, in conjunction with the editor of the volume, Anthony Birley. The collection that is gathered in this volume is a wholly different project, at least in an important respect: it consists of studies that Syme chose not to publish during his lifetime, or laid aside and never got round to publishing. In what follows we shall discuss the reasons that make this material significant, both as a set of original contributions to the history of the Roman Republic and as valuable documents of Syme's intellectual and historiographical trajectory.

¹ The fullest account of Syme's biography is G. W. Bowersock, 'Ronald Syme', *PBA* 84 (1994), 539–63; see also the entry 'Syme, Sir Ronald (1903–1989)' by F. Millar, rev. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford 2004) and, by the same author, 'Style Abides', *JRS* 71 (1981), 144–52 (= *Rome, the Greek World, and the East Volume 2. Government, Society, and Culture in the Roman Empire* [Chapel Hill and London 2004] 399–416).

² See Box 11/4, Syme Archive, Special Collections, Western Manuscripts, Bodleian Library, Oxford. Cf. A. R. Birley, 'Editor's Introduction', in R. Syme, *The Provincial at Rome and Rome and the Balkans 80 BC–AD 14* (Exeter 1999) xi–xx, at xix–xx n. 29.

³ See A. R. Birley, 'Editor's Preface', in R. Syme, *Roman Papers*, VI (Oxford 1991) v.

1. THE BACKGROUND OF THIS VOLUME

Upon Syme's death, a sizeable body of academic papers were found in his rooms at Wolfson College, Oxford. It readily became apparent that, along with a considerable amount of notes, index slips, and letters from other scholars, Syme's papers also included several dozen unpublished studies on a wide range of Roman Republican and imperial topics. Fergus Millar, Syme's literary executor, invited Anthony Birley, the editor of *Roman Papers* III–VII, to sort through that material and reach a decision on what should be published. It soon became apparent that three main clusters of papers could be singled out and reworked with a view to publication: a full book manuscript on Strabo and Asia Minor, written at Istanbul in the early 1940s, which Birley edited as *Anatolica. Studies in Strabo* (published by Oxford University Press in 1995); a set of studies on late Republican topics, including five papers on the history of the Balkans and the Danubian provinces (one dealing with the Augustan period) written in the 1930s and 1940s; the incomplete monograph, *The Provincial at Rome*, written in the 1930s and laid aside in 1936; and a series of contributions on the imperial period. The prospect of an eighth volume of *Roman Papers* was briefly contemplated and eventually abandoned. One of the considerations that led OUP not to pursue the project was the need to clearly differentiate any further collections of Syme's papers from those that he had overseen. After editing *Anatolica*, Birley prepared an edition of some of the other material, which appeared with University of Exeter Press under the title *The Provincial at Rome and Rome and the Balkans 80 BC–AD 14* (1999). In the preface to that collection Birley also provides a full account of the state of Syme's *Nachlass*, which it is unnecessary to restate here in detail.⁴

The collection of papers that is presented in this volume is based on a full overview of the Syme Archive, now stored at the Special Collections of the Bodleian Library in Oxford. It consists of twenty-six contributions on aspects of Roman Republican history: twenty-five free-standing studies and the unfinished manuscript of a book on Rome and Umbria. All these papers survive in a continuous and fully intelligible text. For most of them there are sets of notes written by Syme; others have annotations in the margins.⁵ Many survive in typescript, which suggests that, while they were not deemed by Syme to be ready for publication, they went through at least one stage of revision.

The study of the unpublished work of a scholar, whether never intended for publication or never published despite the author's original intentions, can make an important contribution in several respects. It can further the understanding of the intellectual itineraries of scholars who made a major impact on

⁴ Birley, 'Editor's Introduction', xi–xx. Cf. n. 36 below on the papers on the imperial period not included.

⁵ For full details on each contribution see the Editorial Notes (p. xiii–xv).

the discipline; it may help chart the circumstances that shaped the production of important research; in some cases, it offers original contributions to knowledge. It is hoped that the papers collected in this volume will fulfil all three expectations. On the other hand, the publication of material that was not brought into the public domain by its author is a task that can never be undertaken lightly, and this is a case in point. As a scholar, Syme upheld the highest standards; moreover, he was a notoriously private man, who left no explanation for his decision to leave some of his papers unpublished, even when they were at an advanced stage. These papers are therefore edited in a form that emphasises, also visually, the fact that they were not seen to publication by their author—hence the choice to mark the page breaks of the typescript or (when relevant) manuscript versions of texts and footnotes in this edition.

The papers that are published in this volume are, first and foremost, original assessments of complex problems, based on careful scrutiny of the primary evidence, sharp engagement with modern scholarship, and clear historical vision. Even in the cases where later scholarly developments have changed the terms of the debate on a particular problem, they invite us to reconsider familiar evidence, bring into the discussion usually overlooked sources, and, as Syme's work typically does, revisit established consensuses in a number of areas. Secondly, they cover problems in Roman history that were either not discussed in Syme's published oeuvre or received only cursory treatment in it. The bibliographical addenda to each contribution have the twofold aim of placing the paper within the wider framework of Syme's published work and charting later scholarly developments, both on the central problem discussed in the piece and on specific facets of the discussion.

Thirdly, this collection sets out to offer a new angle on Syme's own intellectual and historiographical trajectory.⁶ The work that he published during his lifetime clearly points to a shift of interests from Republican to imperial and late antique topics in the second part of his career, especially after

⁶ The best starting point for an investigation of this topic is Syme's own introduction to the Italian edition of *Colonial Elites* (written in July 1988), now in *RP* 6.ix–xiv. The early and final stages of Syme's intellectual work have been receiving especially close attention. On the pre-RR years see B. Levick, 'Titus and the Jewish Princess', *Wolfson College, Oxford: College Record* (1999–2000) 60–73 and the recent dissertation by G. A. García Vivas, *Ronald Syme 1928–1939: Una biografía intelectual* (Tenerife 2015). L. Loreto, *Guerra e libertà nella repubblica romana. John R. Seeley e le radici intellettuali della Roman Revolution di Ronald Syme* (Rome 1999) is heavily speculative; cf. E. Gabba, *RSI* 113 (2001), 219–25 (= *Riflessioni storiografiche sul mondo antico* [Como 2007] 223–8). On Syme's late work cf. T. P. Wiseman, 'Late Syme: A Study in Historiography', in E. Dabrowa (ed.), *Donum Amicitiae. Studies in Ancient History* (Krakow 1997) 235–49 [= *Roman Drama and Roman History* (Exeter 1998) 135–52, 213–16]; M. T. Griffin, '“Lifting the Mask”: Syme on Fictional History', in R. Tomlin (ed.), *History and Fiction: Six Essays Celebrating the Life of Sir Ronald Syme* (London 2005) 16–39; K. Bradley, 'Hadrian, Yourcenar, Syme', *Mouseion* 8 (2008), 39–53; L. V. Pitcher, 'Ronald Syme and Ovid's Road not Taken', *Histos* 5 (2011), 232–46.

the publication of *The Roman Revolution*, partly interrupted only by the publication of the Sather Lectures on Sallust in 1964. Tacitus, the study of provincial and colonial elites, and the *Historia Augusta* were the major foci of Syme's work from the early 1950s until his death. However, the studies published in this volume require that picture to be revised. They demonstrate that Syme produced substantial work on Republican history, ranging from specific political developments of the second century BC to the age of Sulla and the evidence of Virgil for the late Republican period, and including a study of constitutional problems. Moreover, they show that he embarked on a full-scale treatment of a subject that he otherwise did not pursue in his published work: an aspect of the Roman conquest of Italy, in the discussion of which he also displays a strong familiarity with the geography and topography of Umbria.

2. THE PAPERS IN THIS COLLECTION

The papers on Republican history collected in this volume deal with a broad range of issues: several of them were not addressed by Syme in print, while others merely received a brief discussion in his published work. Some are nearly three-quarters of a century old, and in some respects they can be said to show their age, but they remain a distinctive and important addition to the body of scholarly work produced by Syme. They fall into several discrete thematic units, which enable us to chart the development of Syme's work on the Roman Republic throughout a much longer span of time than his published oeuvre would lead one to believe. They were written at various points in Syme's lifetime, and the order in which they are printed here is determined by their subject matter, rather than their date.

Three essays deal with the history of three distinguished Roman families in the second half of the second century BC, namely 'The Divorce of Aemilius Paullus', 'The Predominance of the Fulvii', and 'The Politics of the Marcii' (nos. 1–3). Their dating is uncertain: their conception might date as early as the 1930s, although a reference to an article by F. Walbank published in 1941 in 'The Politics of the Marcii' is probably a clue to a later dating, possibly to the first half of the 1940s. The text survives in a typescript with handwritten annotations by Syme. The notes are in manuscript, and in an almost complete form. They mostly consist of references to the primary sources; the only secondary source that is consistently discussed is F. Münzer's great book on Roman aristocratic parties and families.⁷ As Birley has suggested, it is tempting

⁷ F. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart 1920); see the English translation by T. Ridley, *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Families* (Baltimore and London 1999), with an invaluable introduction by R. T. Ridley (xix–xxxviii). See also K.-J. Hölkeskamp,

to see in these essays an implicit tribute to the German master, with whom Syme was in correspondence in the 1930s, and who died in the Nazi concentration camp of Theresienstadt (Terezín, now in the Czech Republic) in 1942.⁸ Some cross-references suggest that these were intended as sections of a larger investigation of some leading families and their role in Republican politics; quite possibly a monograph, in which the Münzerian prosopographical approach would have found a full and coherent application. It is very likely that the brief essay on the end of the Fulvii (no. 19) was part of this project. It is not clear what dissuaded Syme from pursuing this project any further, nor whether the appearance of H. H. Scullard's *Roman Politics 220–150 BC*, with Clarendon Press in 1951, played a role in his decision. The addenda set out to chart some lines of overlap and disagreement between the approaches and conclusions of the two scholars, as well as the discussions of those problems in other moments of Syme's work. His last major work, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford 1986), develops those very interests within a broader thematic discussion, and with a different chronological focus; the Aemilii and the Cornelii receive especially close attention.

As we shall see, the idea of writing the history of a complex historical period through the history of some leading families is not unparalleled in Syme's work, and is echoed in other sections of his *Nachlass*. The unfinished project on the Roman families, however, was not the only attempt to write a monograph on a Republican topic of which traces survive in the Syme Papers. Three papers, which survive only in manuscript, deal with major aspects of the period immediately preceding the Roman Revolution (as Syme defined it in his 1939 monograph): 'The Abdication of Sulla', 'The Speech for Roscius of Ameria', and 'M. Aemilius Lepidus (*cos.* 78 BC)' (nos. 4–6). These essays were written on the back of circulars that Syme received during his time in Istanbul, dating to May 1945. That would suggest a dating to the immediate aftermath of the war.

The essay on Sulla's abdication is a sustained critique of the thesis of J. Carcopino that regarded Sulla as a former warlord who tried to set up a monarchic regime and was ultimately forced out of power by a coalition of his own supporters led by Pompey, the Metelli, and their kinsmen and allies.⁹ The first paper exposes the inadequacies of the evidence on which Carcopino constructed that account. The second refutes Carcopino's chronology, and argues that Cicero's *pro Roscio Amerino*, far from being an attack on the Sullan regime, largely exaggerated by modern scholars, is an instance of 'the gradual return of settled government'. Lepidus and his rise to short-lived power are

'Friedrich Münzer. Werk und Wirkung', in F. Münzer, *Kleine Schriften*, eds. M. Haake and A.-C. Harders (Stuttgart 2012) XIII–XLVI.

⁸ Birley, 'Editor's Note', xiv.

⁹ J. Carcopino, *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée* (Paris 1931).

read against the backdrop of his personal connection with Sulla, as well as his later decision to take on the Sullan settlement: '[e]rected on murder and robbery, the Republic of Sulla invited revolution'. The links between the three essays are apparent, and indeed explicitly mentioned in a few notes. Besides the close analysis of the evidence for the Sullan period, there is a strong engagement with some fragments of Sallust's *Historiae*, especially on the role of periodisation in Sallust's work, which will then leave traces in his later work on Sallust. Birley has persuasively suggested a further level of explanation for Syme's decision to tackle this period: Arnaldo Momigliano, in his classic review of *The Roman Revolution*, which appeared a mere few months after the book's publication, argued that, instead of beginning with the formation of the so-called First Triumvirate (a term that Syme never used), Syme ought to have gone back to Sulla.¹⁰ It looks as if Syme set out to address that objection, and in doing so he produced original discussions, as is the case with the second century essays. It is unclear what led him to stop that pursuit. In the decades following his return to Oxford after the war, he certainly found a large swathe of interests to occupy him: Tacitus, Sallust—including the pseudo-Sallustian works that he conclusively denounced as forgeries—and the *Historia Augusta* (with the series of the Bonner HA Colloquia starting in the mid-1960s).

A third set of shorter studies on late Republican topics develops the interests in the aftermath of the first Civil War and is ostensibly linked to the monograph on Sallust, although it also shows the trace of a continuing interest in the age of Sulla, and especially in the circle that rallied around the dictator. This is the case with 'Satellites of Sulla' (no. 7), 'The Unspeakable Fufidius' (no. 8: a title that explicitly echoes a definition given in *The Roman Revolution*), 'Sallust and Bestia' (no. 10), 'Rome and Arpinum' (no. 11), and 'Catilina's Three Marriages' (no. 13), 'Crassus, Catilina and the Vestal Virgins' (no. 14), 'Sallust on Crassus' (no. 15), 'Sallust and the List of Conspirators' (no. 16), and 'The Gay Sempronia' (no. 18). Again, Syme's habit of reusing circulars and old letters as scrap paper comes to the rescue. The manuscripts of three of these papers (nos. 7, 8, and 11) are written on the back of headed paper that dates after 1955, whereas three (nos. 14, 15, and 16) certainly date to after late 1961 and early 1962. The paper on Sempronia includes a cross-reference on a matter of detail that is not covered elsewhere in Syme's unpublished papers, but is mentioned in the monograph on Sallust. It is safe to regard these essays as pieces that were originally intended as part of that volume (possibly as appendices), but were at some point excluded from it in the long and complex process that intervened between the 1959 Sather Lectures and the 1964 book that stems from them.¹¹

¹⁰ A. Momigliano, *JRS* 30 (1940), 75–80, at 78 (= *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici* [Rome 1960] 407–16, at 412–13).

¹¹ The Preface to *Sallust* is dated 'Oxford, March, 1962' (vi). For further information on the likely dating of the manuscripts of these essays cf. the Editorial Notes above.

The study on *rex Leptasta* (no. 9) also stems from close engagement with Sallust's *Historiae*, but heads towards a different direction. It sets out to solve an interpretative problem regarding a fragment of the *Historiae*, which he proposes to explain by linking it to a passage of Valerius Maximus, only to develop a discussion of the presence of the family of the Paciaeci in Spain. The interest in the late Republic ties in with the long-standing interest in the history of Spain under Rome, and indeed of the elites of the province. The works mentioned in the footnotes are not later than 1958. Syme came back to this problem, but never to that degree of detail. In a conference paper that he delivered in December 1988 he anticipated a contribution on 'The Paciaeci, a Family of Spanish Nobles' that does not survive, and which would have probably covered very similar ground to the *Rex Leptasta* piece.¹² Two essays, which both lack a set of notes, deal with specific aspects of the political history of this period: an overview of the consular elections between 70 and 66 BC, and a discussion of the career of P. Sulla (nos. 12 and 17). Their intended destination is unclear, as well as their exact chronology.¹³ The same applies to a paper on Caesar as *pontifex maximus*, which survives only in typescript, and which cannot be dated with certainty (no. 20). It is a substantial piece, in which Syme set out a radically political reading of Caesar's holding of the supreme priesthood, and explored the circumstances that led to his election. The important paper by L. R. Taylor on the election of the *pontifex maximus* in the late Republic, published in 1942, is not mentioned in the footnotes, and this strongly suggests that the study dates to the early 1940s.¹⁴ The appearance of Taylor's study may well have been the factor that led Syme not to publish his piece.

The last group of essays takes us to the period covered in *The Roman Revolution*. 'Cicero's Change of Plan' (no. 21) is a discussion of a specific incident in Cicero's life, when he still entertained the possibility of a coalition of Octavian, Republicans, and 'moderate Caesarians' against Antony; all the entries in the bibliography predate *RR* and it is possible that this may be a piece written originally for that purpose. The same applies to the brief discussion of Nicolaus of Damascus, ch. 28 and 31 (no. 22), in which he draws attention to the omission of the character of Salvidienus from the narrative of Nicolaus: a deliberate excision, from 'an official and pedagogic historian'. There are no elements to safely date these essays; what is certain is that Syme kept thinking

¹² 'Some Unrecognized Authors from Spain', *RP* 6.463–72, at 469. A set of handwritten notes on the Paciaeci and the passages of Sallust and Valerius Maximus discussed in the *rex Leptasta* paper survives on the back of a circular dating to January 1989 (Box 10/1).

¹³ The paper on the consular elections was probably written before 1964; see the Addenda.

¹⁴ L. R. Taylor, 'The Election of the *Pontifex Maximus* in the Late Republic', *CP* 37 (1942), 421–4.

and writing about this period even after the appearance of *RR*.¹⁵ The extensive essay on Virgil's 'first patron' (no. 23), which sets out to show the strong relevance of Asinius Pollio in Virgil's early poetic work, and dates the alignment of Virgil with Maecenas and Octavian to 39–38 BC, when Pollio was absent from Rome, may safely be dated after mid-March 1943 (the back of a circular offers some information, yet again). The notes that accompany the other essay on Caesar and Augustus in Virgil also take us to the spring of the same year, and show that at some point during his stay in Turkey Syme came back to Triumviral and early Augustan history.

Interest in literary matters, and especially in poetry, is not surprising in Syme.¹⁶ A preoccupation with constitutional and ceremonial problems, however, is less predictable. The Archive includes an essay in which the number of the *fasces* that a magistrate was entitled to display received a detailed discussion. Far from being the exploration of an antiquarian puzzle or a casual foray into unfamiliar territory, this essay shows an unusual side of a long-standing, and indeed irrepressible interest of Syme in the 'realities of power', as well as in matters of periodisation.¹⁷

The essay on the *fasces* is in fact a broader discussion of *imperium*, and takes us into a territory that does not appear, at least at first glance, to be obviously Symean. The large body of notes in Syme's papers on this topic, however, strongly suggests that he had a keen interest in it, and not just for teaching reasons. This piece has a minimal apparatus of notes, but can safely be dated after the War: it opens with a mildly polemical reference to F. Schultz's *Roman Legal Science*, and later engages with essays by J. Béranger and E. V. Staveley. The constitutional problems of the age of the Roman Revolution had been intensely debated in the previous years, and had attracted the interest of scholars of the calibre of Hugh Last and A. H. M. Jones.¹⁸ External evidence enables us to place the paper more precisely in the late 1950s, since Syme gave a lecture on the number of *fasces* in 1958 at Cambridge. Syme's fundamental working assumption—i.e. that there was a link between the hierarchy among different *imperia* and the number of *fasces* that surrounded a magistrate—was

¹⁵ Birley, 'Editor's Note', xiii reports that the essays were found in an envelope marked '1936'.

¹⁶ Cf. e.g. *History in Ovid* (Oxford 1978); *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford 1986) 382–402.

¹⁷ I am drawing this expression from C. Pelling, 'The Rhetoric of *The Roman Revolution*', *Syllecta Classica* 26 (2015) 207–47, at 211—a paper that offers a pioneering attempt to do justice to the literary and rhetorical dimension of Syme's great book. Cf. Loreto, *Guerra e libertà*, 96, who views Syme's tendency to 'marginalise' constitutional history as a 'polemical' reaction to the methodological paradigm of Last and Mommsen.

¹⁸ H. Last, 'Imperium maius. A Note', *JRS* 37 (1947), 157–64; A. H. M. Jones, 'The *imperium* of Augustus', *JRS* 41 (1951), 112–19 (= *Studies in Roman Government and Law* [Oxford 1960] 7–14). For an excellent discussion of Syme's place in the modern scholarly debate on *imperium* see K. M. Girardet, 'Imperium "maius". Politische und verfassungsrechtliche Aspekte. Versuch einer Klärung', in A. Giovannini (ed.), *La Révolution romaine après Ronald Syme. Bilans et perspectives* (Vandoeuvres and Geneva 2000) 167–227.

to be found a few years later in a paper by E. V. Staveley, which may have persuaded Syme not to see his own contribution to print.¹⁹

Taken as a whole, these studies on late Republican history take us into directions that Syme's published work did not quite take; some of them are objectively surprising. The papers at the Bodleian reveal a somewhat striking interest of Syme in the Roman conquest of Italy. Most notably, they include a typescript of what appears to be a substantial portion of a monograph on Rome and Umbria: this covers the whole age of the conquest of the region until the Augustan period.²⁰ It certainly dates to the second half of the 1950s. A chapter on Calvisius Sabinus ends with a forward-reference to the discussion of another Sabinus who was a 'literary problem': that must be the piece on Sabinus the muleteer that appeared in *Latomus* in 1958.²¹ The discussion of Umbria is based exclusively on the literary sources and the epigraphical evidence. It shows no interest in the archaeological documentation, but reveals a remarkably close familiarity with the geography and topography of the region, which betrays a direct knowledge of the terrain.

The historical itinerary that it pursues is very instructive. Syme ranges from the discussion of some key stages of the military conquest of the region, down to the position of the local elites in negotiating the impact of Roman hegemony. Developments at Spolegium receive special attention, and tie in with the complex history of the Civil War: the concluding chapter is on C. Calvisius Sabinus (*cos.* 39 BC) and the dedication to *Pietas* that he set up at Spolegium. Another portion of this study was used in a short paper on Spolegium and the via Flaminia that Syme presented at a conference organised by the *Dialoghi di Archeologia* research group in September 1969.²² Yet, the discussion that is developed in this typescript reaches a much greater level of detail.

3. OTHER PAPERS FROM THE SYME ARCHIVE

Such a keen interest in the local elites of Italy is not surprising, of course, and goes back to the seminal article on Caesar and Italy that Syme published in

¹⁹ E. S. Staveley, 'The *fascēs* and *imperium maius*', *Historia* 12 (1963), 458–84. A handwritten annotation on the typescript, in which a 1965 paper by J. J. Nicholls is mentioned, suggests that Syme may have come back to the topic in the mid-1960s.

²⁰ Box 6/3. The intended chapter sequence was as follows: I. Rome and Umbria; II. The Roman Conquest; III. Camerinum and the Road to the North; IV. Spolegium and the Via Flaminia; V. Roman Annexations in Umbria; VI. Umbria and the Civil Wars; VII. Political Partisans from Spolegium [+ Cocceius]; VIII. The *Pietas* of Calvisius Sabinus; IX. Propertius; X. Some Umbrian Names; XI. Illyrians in Umbria; XII. Consuls from Umbria; XIII. Iavoleni Prisci; XIV. Conclusion: The Italian Aristocracy [The Emperor Nerva].

²¹ 'Sabinus the Muleteer', *Latomus* 17 (1958), 73–80 (= *RP* 1.393–99).

²² 'Spolegium and the Via Flaminia', *DdA* 4–5 (1972) 422–30 (= *RP* 3.885–91). Cf. the reference to a visit to Spolegium in 1948 at 429 (= 890).

1938.²³ It emerges even more forcefully in another project on which he embarked roughly at the same time: a project entitled 'Some Etruscan families', which sets out to study the history of the dealings between Etruria and Rome by taking the history of the developments of the dealings with a number of leading families.²⁴ It also includes a section on haruspicy, which Syme of course understood as a lore practised by the Etruscan elites. There is also a discussion of the theory of the Etruscan ages, and the aim was to encompass the history of the Etruscan elites in Roman context until the development of late Antiquity. Again, there is no interest in the archaeological and iconographical evidence: the discussion is entirely based on the literary evidence and the inscriptional material. The project was interrupted after chapter 14 ('Emperors with Etruscan Names'). As Birley has suggested, the then ongoing work of William Harris on Rome in Etruria and Umbria may have persuaded Syme not to pursue the endeavour any further.²⁵ The manuscript is in an obviously rough state, no parts of it were typed, and indeed in places it is virtually illegible. Even the sequence of the chapters that Syme did begin to write is not continuous: no text survives for chapters I, V, VI, and XI. Unlike the material on Umbria, the papers on the Etruscan families cannot be reconstructed as a coherent or continuous text. They fall into an altogether different category of unpublished papers. Their existence is very significant; they are clearly stubs of original and valuable research, but are in an irretrievably fragmentary state. It would be impossible to secure their publication as an intelligible text without a heavy editorial intervention. There is also no clear evidence that Syme ever envisaged their redaction into a reasonably coherent set of texts, as can by contrast be said of the unfinished project of Umbria and of most of the Republican papers discussed above.

The papers collected in this volume are not later than the first half of the 1960s, but a comprehensive overview of the Archive reveals that Syme's interest in Republican (not just late Republican) matters was even more wide-ranging than these twenty-six studies suggest. His *Nachlass* includes the first two chapters of a book on the fall of the Roman Republic which Syme agreed to write for a US publisher, The Dial Press, in the late 1960s: *The Triumph of Caesarism*. It was advertised in the press, but never came to completion. These pieces have been published elsewhere by the editor of the present collection: although the book was not brought to completion, the

²³ R. Syme, 'Caesar, the Senate, and Italy', *PBSR* 14 (1938), 1–38 (= *RP* 1.88–119).

²⁴ *Some Etruscan Families*, Box 10/2. A list of chapter titles survives: I. Introduction; II. Cities and Legends; III. Dynastic families; IV. The doom of Etruria; V. Caecina, the client of Cicero; VI. *Etrusca disciplina*; VII. The Etruscan diaspora; VIII. Etruria *renascens*; IX. Caecina Severus; X. Caecina Paetus; XI. Thræsea Paetus; XII. Allies of Thræsea; XIII. Other Etruscan families; XIV. Emperors with Etruscan names; XV. The Pagan Aristocracy; XVI. Bogus Genealogies; XVII. Macrobius and Namatianus; XVIII. Epilogue.

²⁵ Cf. W. V. Harris, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* (Oxford 1971).

drafts warranted publication because they were complete, albeit unannotated studies.²⁶ Several chapter outlines survive in a folder among Syme's papers, as well as the manuscripts of the two opening chapters, in which he speaks in his distinctive voice about issues that he hardly touched upon in his scholarly work: the impact of the empire in Republican Rome, the new social and economic dynamics that emerged in the second century BC, and the repercussions that they had on the political competition in Rome. It is remarkable that, when Syme was invited to write a general overview of the fall of the Roman Republic, he opened it by discussing a facet of the period that is hardly acknowledged at all in *The Roman Revolution*. It is hard not to see a trace of the work of Syme's successor in the Camden Chair, P. A. Brunt (1917–2005), and of his ground-breaking research on the economic and social history of Republican Italy.²⁷ Like the unpublished article on the *fascēs* and *imperium*, *The Triumph of Caesarism* has the advantage of showing us a dimension of Syme's thinking that we would not have otherwise gleaned from his published work.

The whole structure of the unfinished monograph manifests a willingness to frame familiar problems in innovative ways.²⁸ The same applies to other later sections of the Archive, from which it appears that an interest in the late Republican period endured until the final years of Syme's life. A more substantial body of material survives in a free-standing folder, which provides evidence for the continuing interest of Syme in Julius Caesar, on whom he was writing a book in the final years of his life.²⁹ The manuscript of a few chapters survives, as well as several chapter outlines, and three versions of the table of contents.³⁰ A coherent text cannot be reconstructed; in places the surviving chapters are not in continuous prose, but are schematic outlines of a text that was intended for completion at a later stage (e.g. the chapter on 'Caesar as a *nobilis*'). To borrow an expression recently used by the editor of a scholarly

²⁶ F. Santangelo, 'An Unfinished Book by Ronald Syme: *The Triumph of Caesarism*', QS 79 (2013), 5–31.

²⁷ Santangelo, 'An Unfinished Book', 11–12. Cf. also the discussion of economic factors in ch. 6 of the unfinished book on Umbria.

²⁸ One of the two surviving chapter outlines reads as follows: 'The Diagnosis; The Sources of Power; Pompeius Magnus; Caesar the Dictator; The Triumvirs; The new despotism; The war of Actium; Legalised absolutism or The powers of the ruler; The tasks of Empire; The new oligarchy; Domestic policy; Stability and cohesion; The last years; Persuasion or consent; The Post-Mortem; The Apologia.' For more details see Santangelo, 'An Unfinished Book', 6–7.

²⁹ Cf. also the public lecture 'Caesar: Drama, Legend, History', NYRB 32.3 (28 February 1985), 12–14 (= RP 5.702–707).

³⁰ Box 10/2. The fullest one is as follows: 'I. Shakespeare; II. Legends, Ancient and Modern; III. The Career of a *Nobilis*; IV. What C. wanted; V. The personality; VI. The Last Five Months; VII. March 14; VIII. The Conspirators; IX. Brutus; X. Cassius; XI. Decimus Brutus; XII. Dubious Paternities; XIII. The Significance of Decimus and Trebonius; XIV. Concord and Disruption; XV. Philippi; XVI. Shakespeare Again; XVII. Epilogue'. For an insightful discussion of this project

text, no ‘rehydration’ process could turn those notes into an intelligible text that could legitimately be regarded as Syme’s work.³¹ One of the most original choices that Syme made in designing that unfinished book was to include in a biography of Caesar some chapters devoted to his assassins and their aims and aspirations. The first chapter, which Syme apparently never got down to writing, was promisingly entitled ‘Shakespeare’.³² Syme’s reconstruction of the guest list of the dinner on the night before the Ides of March, in which Caesar famously discussed his preferred type of death, has deservedly found a mention in the commentary that C. Pelling has devoted to Plutarch’s *Life of Caesar*, but it is impossible to go beyond brief extrapolations of that kind.³³

A less sizeable set of papers also survives in a folder marked ‘Livy’, which served as preparatory material for a full-scale study on the historian from Patavium. The surviving chapter outline shows that the discussion was to start with a discussion of the previous history of Roman historiography, and would then move to an assessment of the biography and political views of the historian, who is at one point defined as ‘a post-war historian’. There were clear areas of overlap with the classic 1959 essay on Livy and Augustus, although it is impossible to establish whether there would have been further developments.³⁴ Tellingly, a whole chapter was to be devoted to books 134–42, and the closing section of the book was to provide a full discussion of Livy’s reception in antiquity and through the ages. For a few chapters sketchy summaries survive, none of which exceed one page. This project occupied Syme in the final period of his life, even after the inception of the unfinished volume on Caesar: some notes are written on the back of circulars dating to 1987. Finally, there is a three-page manuscript, apparently intended for a public lecture, in

see M. T. Griffin, “Lifting the Mask”, 30–1 and ‘Introduction’, in M. Griffin (ed.), *A Companion to Julius Caesar* (Oxford and Malden 2009) 1–8 at 8.

³¹ D. Scott, ‘Editor’s Introduction’, in M. Burnyeat and M. Frede, *The Pseudo-Platonic Seventh Letter*, ed. D. Scott (Oxford 2015) viii–xiv, at xi. The seminar notes by Frede that are published in that volume are a remarkable example of text that, in spite of not being in continuous prose, could be transcribed as a coherent and readable piece with minimal editorial intervention.

³² Cf., however, ‘Caesar: Drama, Legend, History’, *RP* 5.702–703.

³³ C. Pelling, *Plutarch. Caesar* (Oxford 2011) 471.

³⁴ ‘Livy and Augustus’, *HSCP* 64 (1950), 64–87 (= *RP* 1.400–54). The table of contents offers the following overview (I am including between square brackets some annotations that are written after some headings): ‘I. Roman History. Cicero, Sallust, Livy. Life of Livy. Initial problems. II. His age. III. Date of inception. IV. The impulsion [in general]. V. The personal incentive: preparation, exposure, capacity. VI. Planning and structure. The recent history. [49–44, 44–42, 41–29. Therefore 20 the terminus. Cf. Virgil.] VII. Books 134–42. [29–9. Republic of Caesar Augustus. Rhythm. Contemporary history. Its dangers. When to stop? The Augustan Books. How good?] VIII. Estimates through the ages. IX. Livy today. X. Who was Livy? [Sallust, no problem—*falso*. Ambiguous, ambitious. A post-war opportunist. He saw the market. Few rivals in the sequel.]’. The reference to *falso* in Sallust is surely to *Cat.* 51.36 and esp. *Jug.* 1.1, on which see Sallust (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1964) 122, 214–15.

which Syme set out to compare the Social War and the American Secession War. It is regrettable that the text breaks off and prevents us from appreciating how he developed it, without offering any clues on the dating of the piece.³⁵

This set of materials serves as valuable evidence for any account of Syme's intellectual trajectory and will no doubt be of interest to any who may set out to write his biography. Their fragmentary state and the impossibility of drawing a coherent text from the manuscripts rule them out for the purposes of this discussion. The papers that are published in this collection are the studies of Republican topics for which a continuous text survives, whether in typescript or in manuscript. This volume marks the publication of the whole set of Roman papers that survive in the Syme *Nachlass*, with the exception of six papers on imperial or late imperial topics, which are neither relevant to the remit of this collection nor have been included in *The Provincial at Rome*.³⁶ A study entitled 'The Husbands of Scribonia', which is a preliminary version of the discussion of the marriages of Octavian's second wife that is found in *The Augustan Aristocracy*, is also excluded from this collection.³⁷ A paper in French on Tacitus and Proust, dating to the early 1960s, which brings together and develops two major long-standing interests of Syme, was published as a free-standing piece.³⁸ Finally, it is worth mentioning a set of manuscript papers on Greek History topics (such as 'Fundamental dates of the Pentekontaetia' and 'Periklean budget 450–413 BC') that were discovered in the Wolfson College Archive in early 2015. They appear to be in Syme's handwriting and to date to the early phase of his career, probably to the 1930s. They may well relate to his Ancient History tutorial teaching at Trinity College, Oxford, in that very period.

The Archive also sheds light on Syme's working methods. Eighteen boxes out of the fifty-nine that form the Archive contain about four cigar boxes each, which Syme re-used to accommodate thousands of notes, usually taken on the back of circulars (and therefore often easily datable) and cut to the size of index slips, carefully sorted into thematic units that are in themselves revealing: 'Sallust', 'Tacitus', 'Livy', 'Ammianus', 'Sallust', 'Moesia', 'Gaul',

³⁵ 'Secession and War: 91 BC and AD 1861' (Box 6/4).

³⁶ 'The *Titulus Tiburtinus*' (Box 10/1), 'The Iterated Legionary Command' (11/2), 'Aelius Aristides' (11/4, 11/5), 'The Martyrdom of Polycarpus' (11/2, 11/5), 'Proconsuls in Patristic Sources' (11/2 and 11/4), 'The Punishment of Christians' (11/2, 11/5). Cf. Birley, 'Editor's Introduction', xviii.

³⁷ Copies survive in Boxes 10/1 and 11/1; cf. also the material in 2/2. See AA 248–55. For a reassessment of the problem cf. P. Tansey, 'The Perils of Prosopography: The Case of the Corneli Dolabellae', *ZPE* 130 (2000), 265–71 and M. Canas, 'Scribonia Caesaris et le *stemma* des Scribonii Libones', *RPh* 83 (2009), 183–210. The paper entitled 'Marriage Alliances and Avoidances at Rome' (Box 6/1 contains a photocopy of the manuscript) was published as 'Dynastic Marriages in the Roman Aristocracy', *Diogenes* 135 (1986), 1–10 (= *RP* 6.338–45).

³⁸ R. Syme, 'Tacite et Proust', ed. F. Santangelo, *Histos* 7 (2013), 128–45.

‘Arvals’, ‘Parthia’, ‘Danubiana’, ‘Nomenclature’, ‘Pauly-Wissowa’—and the list could continue.³⁹ A full-scale biography of Syme, which awaits to be written, will have to resort to the evidence of the Archive as a major, if somewhat idiosyncratic, resource. Those hundreds of carefully compiled notes draw attention to a fundamental, and sometimes overlooked, side of that great scholar. He was, by anyone’s standards, a man of genius. At the same time, his work was rooted in a patient, long-standing, methodical scrutiny and gathering of the evidence, of texts ancient and modern, great pieces of literature and modest funerary inscriptions, and arguments produced by scholars both great and obscure. Behind the unique elegance and (to use C. Pelling’s expression) infectious ‘knowingness’ of Syme’s prose, and the clarity and range of his historical vision, there was a humble and relentless engagement with formidably diverse and demanding clusters of material.

4. EDITORIAL PRACTICE

Some general comments are in order about the criteria followed in this edition. Wherever possible the conventions followed by Syme have been respected, but some changes have been made, both for the sake of internal consistency and in order to adhere to the editing and formatting conventions that prevail in current scholarship. The format of the references to ancient sources has been changed: Arabic numbers have been used throughout. References that included ‘ff’ have been supplemented. The Latin quotes, which Syme usually has between inverted commas, have been italicised. Typos (which, in the typescripts, are not to be attributed to Syme) have been tacitly corrected. In a handful of passages where portions of text were clearly missing these have been supplemented between square brackets.

Full bibliographical details have been provided for all the modern works cited by Syme and the same referencing system has been implemented throughout the collection. Editorial integrations are between square brackets, unless it is made clear in the first footnote that a whole set of references in a paper has been added by the editor. Any overlap between the author’s voice and that of the editor has been avoided.

The transcription includes the page breaks of the original manuscript or typescript in the main text; the more advanced version has been taken as reference for each essay. In the pieces of which only a typescript survives typos have been tacitly corrected. No attempt has been made to update the footnotes,

³⁹ Syme Archive, Boxes 12/1–4, 13/1–4, 14/1–11.

although references to collections of *Kleine Schriften* that appeared after the papers were published (including Syme's *Roman Papers*) have been included. References to entries in *L'Année Épigraphique*, *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, and *Roman Republican Coinage* have also been added wherever necessary.

The Divorce of Aemilius Paullus

[1] The Aemilii Paulli have been extremely lucky. The consul who fell on the stricken field of Cannae acquired a posthumous reputation for judgement, courage, and constancy, suitably celebrated by the annalists and moralists of Rome, whereas his colleague, C. Terentius Varro, survived the battle and took the blame.¹ The sterling quality of Paullus was consonant with his family and station: Varro was a person of obscure origin and unsatisfactory conduct, an upstart and a demagogue. If Paullus was a paragon, he was yet outshone by the various and resplendent virtues of his son. The younger Aemilius Paullus in his second consulate won the battle of Pydna and put an end to the Macedonian monarchy. His signal service to Rome was political as well as military—it vindicated the capacity of the older families and inaugurated a brief period of concord and harmony in Roman public life. Frugal, pious, and incorruptible, Paullus displayed the solid merit of the Roman aristocrat, but with a difference: it was refined and embellished by all that was best in the culture of Hellas.

One of the sons of Paullus passed by adoption into the house of the Scipiones. The Greek friends of Scipio Aemilianus eagerly praised the father of their illustrious patron; and the Roman tradition is consistent. The last generation of the Republic, looking back with nostalgia to the men of the great age, recalled or enhanced their virtues and falsified the historical record, if that had not been done already.² For Cicero, the figure of a liberal-conservative statesman, blending native gravity with Greek [2] culture, possessed a peculiar attraction. Lacking the claims of noble birth or military glory, Cicero could hardly identify himself with an Aemilius or a Scipio, but he was pleased to

[1] ¹ Compare the acute remarks of F. Münzer, *RE* VA, 684.

² Cf. F. Münzer, 'Atticus als Geschichtschreiber', *Hermes* 40 (1905), 50–100 [= *KS*, 279–329], esp. 68–77 [= *KS*, 297–306]. The Roman annalists whose data were adopted by Atticus (and therefore employed by Cicero) dishonestly covered up certain anti-Scipionic actions of Cato. For example, they alleged that Scipio's death preceded the censorship of Cato in order to obscure the fact that Cato enrolled L. Valerius Flaccus as *princeps senatus* in his place.

contemplate himself in the garb and role of Laelius, the faithful and sagacious friend of Aemilianus.³

The reputation of Paullus was secure and canonical: no wonder that Plutarch's biography is a panegyric. It would be tedious and unprofitable to expatiate upon this virtuous and amiable character. There is, however, a mysterious incident in the career of Paullus. Its elucidation will throw light upon the true nature of Roman political life in the age of the great conquests, a subject which Cicero and Plutarch have done much to obscure. After a long married life, Aemilius Paullus divorced Papiria, the daughter of C. Papirius Maso (*cos.* 231 BC). She had borne him two sons.⁴ The reason was not known to Plutarch. The biographer is puzzled. He helps himself out by retailing a familiar Roman anecdote ('you don't know where the shoe pinches'), supported by sage and superfluous reflections on the subject of marital incompatibility. Perhaps he is right. But Plutarch might have known that marriage and divorce in the dynastic houses of the Roman nobility were not mere matters of a man's private taste and inclination: they were political events, marking as they did the formation, the confirmation, or the dissolution of political alliances.

The date of Paullus' divorce and remarriage is therefore of some historical importance. The births of the two sons of Papiria certainly fall in the years 187–184 BC. The elder, who was given [3] in adoption to the Fabii (Q. Fabius Aemilianus, *cos.* 145 BC) was probably born in 186 BC, the younger, Scipio Aemilianus, late in 185 or early in 184 BC.⁵ The children by the second marriage provide the *terminus ante quem*. There were two sons and three daughters. The sons both died about the time of the celebration of Paullus' Macedonian triumph, aged fourteen and twelve respectively: the years of their births are therefore 181 BC and 179 BC.⁶ As for the three daughters, the youngest was a child at the time of the Macedonian war; the husbands of the other two Aemiliae were Cato's son Marcus (who died when praetor

³ Cf. especially *Fam.* 5.9.3, to the address of Pompeius Magnus. Cicero even suggested referring to himself by the pseudonym of Laelius in confidential correspondence with Atticus (*Att.* 2.19.5; 20.5).

⁴ Plut. *Aem.* 5: Ἐγγημε δὲ Παπυρίαν, ἀνδρὸς ὑπατικοῦ Μάσωνος θυγατέρα, καὶ χρόνον συνοικήσας πολὺν, ἀφῆκε τὸν γάμον, καίπερ ἐξ αὐτῆς καλλιτεκνότατος γενόμενος [‘He married Papiria, daughter of Maso, a man of consular rank, and after having lived with her for a long time he divorced her, although she had made him father of the most virtuous sons’]. If Plutarch is right about the duration of the marriage, it must have remained childless for a long time. The divorce falls about 183 BC. Papiria, the daughter of a man who was consul in 231 BC, and who died in 213 BC (Livy 25.2.1) was not in her first youth. The Roman aristocracy generally married young (cf. Münzer, *RA* 105–6). Yet Paullus' marriage to Papiria might after all have been comparatively recent, contracted in his mature age. Compare the case of Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, whose marriage to Cornelia, the daughter of Scipio Africanus, belongs a dozen years after his consulate.

⁵ For a discussion of the evidence see Münzer, *RE* IV, 1440.

[2] ⁶ Plut. *Aem.* 35.

designate c.152 BC) and Q. Aelius Tubero, who was the most virtuous and impoverished of the Romans.⁷ Unfortunately the dates of their births cannot be fixed. Plutarch designates Cato and Tubero, both of whom served in the campaign of Pydna, as sons-in-law of Paullus. If his language is strictly interpreted and the marriages be assumed already to have taken place, the girls might have been born in 182 and 180 BC. But they may only have been betrothed, not yet married, in the year of Pydna (168 BC).⁸

However that may be, divorce and remarriage certainly fall in the years 184–182 BC. The dating gives the clue—Paullus' action bears some relation to his candidature for the consulate in 183 BC. Hitherto his official career had been slow and arduous: by 184 or 183 BC his prospects for the consulate might well have appeared hopeless. Born about 228 BC, Paullus was praetor in 191, his colleague being M. Aemilius Lepidus, the chief member of the only other branch of the Aemilii to hold consular rank in this [4] period. The patricians were still able to monopolise one of the consulates every year—it was not until 172 BC that the first plebeian pair invaded the Fasti. But the competition was fierce in their own ranks. Declining fertility, frequent deaths, lack of talent, or lack of money depressed many of the patrician *gentes*. The last consulate of a Papirius belongs to 231 BC, of a Veturius to 206 BC; the Furii were in low water; the Claudii Neroni disappear from the consular Fasti after 202 BC, never to return so long as the Republic lasts; and the main line of the Fabii was all but extinct. The Aemilii were numerous and prolific enough.⁹ Their record, however, had been far from impressive. In the course of each of the two long wars against Carthage they had been able to show only one consul; and recently, between 216 and 187 BC, not a single consul, censor, or dictator, as against thirteen Cornelii, six Fabii, and five Claudii. The first Aemilian consul since Cannae was M. Aemilius Lepidus (187 BC), after two defeats inflicted by the powerful Fulvii.¹⁰ Lepidus in his consulate arraigned the policy and acts of his enemy, M. Fulvius Nobilior;¹¹ and Paullus shortly afterwards made an attack upon Cn. Manlius Vulso, the colleague (and presumably the political ally) of Nobilior.¹² This seems to have done him no good—at least there is no evidence that Lepidus supported the candidature of Paullus, and subsequently their paths seem to have diverged. In the year 180 BC Lepidus went in with the Fulvio-Manlian group, got himself elected by their help *pontifex maximus* and censor for the next year with M. Fulvius Nobilior as his colleague; and Nobilior [5] duly enrolled his new ally as *princeps senatus*. This compact was the fruit of ambition and intrigue: it was revealed to the world by a solemn act of

⁷ Plut. *Aem.* 5.

⁸ The language of Plutarch implies that the two elder Aemiliae were daughters of the second marriage. He mentions them in a subordinate place, after the sons of both marriages. It is just possible that they were daughters of Papiria.

⁹ Cf. Münzer, *RA* 167–80 and the table, 179.

¹⁰ Livy 38.43.1; cf. 40.46.14.

¹¹ Livy 38.43.1–4.

¹² Livy 38.44.11–45.2.

reconciliation between old enemies in the Campus Martius, an edifying theme which posterity invoked to sanctify the 'renunciation of private feuds for the good of the Commonwealth'.¹³

In such wise did Aemilius Lepidus achieve in Roman public life an eminence without equal in the interval between the primacy of Scipio Africanus and the predominance of Aemilianus. Paullus was not so alert and adaptable. Where was he to find allies? Lepidus does not seem to have helped him. Nor did a family alliance with the Livii, which had been contracted for political advantage, perhaps quite recently, show the desired consequences. C. Livius Salinator (*cos.* 188 BC) had adopted the brother of Paullus, the first attested adoption of a patrician by a plebeian.¹⁴

Paullus had been outdistanced by Lepidus for the consulate of 187 BC. In 186 the patrician consul was a Postumius, in 185 a Claudius. It is not known how many attempts Paullus made. Only one of his *repulsae* has been recorded. When he stood for election in 185 BC, a year of bitter competition between four patricians and three plebeians, he was reckoned among the *veteres candidati*.¹⁵ According to Livy, previous failure enhanced a man's claim to the honour.¹⁶ It is doubtful whether people thought so at the time. An anecdote retailed by Livy suggests that three *repulsae* were considered fatal: it was time to give up.¹⁷

[6] In 185 BC the consul Ap. Claudius Pulcher pushed the candidature of his brother by methods which the tradition, seldom kind to the Claudii, stigmatises as a flagrant exhibition of *vis Claudiana*.¹⁸ The Claudii prevailed. It is not recorded that Paullus put forward his candidature in the next year. The season was highly unpropitious—it was the censorship of Cato and Valerius Flaccus. As a result of political persecution, Scipio Africanus had retired from public life. Cato the Censor nominated Flaccus in his stead as *princeps senatus*; and, when reviewing the Roman knights, deprived Scipio's brother of his *equus publicus*.¹⁹ Now Paullus' sister was the wife of Africanus. A connection that should have been highly profitable became prejudicial precisely when he needed it most, in the years of his desperate struggle for the consulate.

However, in 183 BC, Paullus was at last elected, along with a *novus homo*, Cn. Baebius Tamphilus. Scipio Africanus died at Liternum, probably early in

¹³ Such is the phrase of Cic. *Prov. cons.* 20: *ipsas inimicitias, depono rei publicae causa* ['I lay aside even my enmities for the sake of the republic']. The scene is vividly described in Livy 40.45.6–41.14.

¹⁴ This is deduced from the nomenclature of C. Livius M. Aemiliani f. M. n. Drusus, consul in 147 BC along with Scipio Aemilianus, and therefore his cousin, cf. Münzer, *RA* 158–9. The consul of 147 BC was probably born about 191–188 BC, at which time his father had passed out of the *gens* Cornelia. Livii and Aemilii were old allies, cf. Münzer, *RA* 158–9.

¹⁵ Livy 39.32.6.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ Livy 40.37.6.

¹⁸ [Mommsen, 'Die patricischen Claudier', *RF* I, Berlin 1864, 285–318. P. Claudius Pulcher: Livy 39.32–3. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.4; Suet. *Tib.* 2.4; Münzer, *RE* III, 2664.]

¹⁹ This is not the place to discuss the character and chronology of the attacks on the Scipiones. On the role of Cato cf. n. 2.

this year;²⁰ and there may well have been a public revulsion of feeling in favour of his family and relatives. Yet this may not have been enough to ensure the consulate of Paullus. He divorced Papiria about this time. It is a fair conjecture that Paullus got rid of Papiria in order to contract a new alliance with wealth and influence. The patrician Papirii were now in a steady decline that nothing could stop; they had no prospect of the consulate, they had nothing more to offer; and Papiria after the divorce lived in straitened circumstances.²¹ It therefore remains to speculate about the identity of Paullus' [7] new wife.

A political alliance with the Baebii seems pretty clear. Paullus allowed his colleague to return to Rome from Liguria to hold the elections—and secure the consulate for his brother Marcus, a procedure which has escaped the reprobation of high-minded annalists.²² Not only that. Another member of the family, L. Baebius (*pr.* 189 BC), bearing the significant *cognomen* of Dives, had probably served as a legate of Scipio Africanus.²³ Furthermore, no fewer than three Baebii are attested in official positions about the time of the Macedonian war and Paullus' second consulate.²⁴ Hence grounds for the conjecture that Paullus took a wife from among the prolific Baebii. It will, however, be doubted whether a marriage alliance with the family of a *novus homo*, even wealthy, was enough. Cn. Baebius Tamphilus himself needed considerable support. His praetorship lay many years back, in 199 BC: his career was much slower than that of any other *novus homo* of the time.²⁵ One should rather ask what were the hidden resources and secret influences that promoted at the same time a pair of retardatory candidates, in appearance so unpromising.

The solution might be sought, even if it cannot be found, in the subsequent political constellation at the time of the Macedonian war. Splendidly attested by the elevation of M. Lepidus in 180 BC, and by the consulate of a Manlius and a Fulvius in the next year, blood-brothers though the historians know it not, the Fulvio-Manlian combination prevailed for several years until it had to admit the Postumii, and perhaps the Popillii, to a share in the spoils of politics.²⁶ Towards the year 173 BC a strong current of [8] opposition to the control of affairs by the Senate becomes perceptible; and it is likely enough

²⁰ The testimony of Polybius and of Rutilius Rufus, mentioned and rejected by Livy (39.52.1), is adequate. The dates produced by the Roman annalists are fraudulent as well as erroneous.

²¹ Polybius 32.12.6–7. For a stemma of the patrician Papirii see Münzer, *RA* 114. The last representatives were L. Papirius Maso (*pr.* 176 BC) and that C. Papirius Maso who was successfully prosecuted by T. Coponius of Tibur [3] (*Cic. Balb.* 53–54). Münzer adds C. Papirius C. f. Vel. Masso, attested by the inscription *ILS* 907. But this person can hardly be a patrician, for he belongs to the *tribus Velina*, which was only instituted in 241 BC.

²² Livy 40.17.8. ²³ Livy 30.25.2.

²⁴ L. Baebius, envoy to Macedonia, 169 BC; Cn. Baebius Tamphilus, *pr.* 168 BC; A. Baebius, at Demetrias, 167 BC. For the evidence see *RE* II, 2728–30.

²⁵ Observe, for contrast, M. Porcius Cato, *pr.* 198, *cos.* 195; M'. Acilius Glabrio, *pr.* 196, *cos.* 191; Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, *pr.* 194, *cos.* 192; and even L. Porcius Licinus, *pr.* 193, *cos.* 184.

²⁶ [See *RA* 202–3, 208].

that hostility to patricians was a vital question.²⁷ The brothers Popillius (consuls in succession in 173 and 172), of a plebeian noble house now emerging from an obscurity that had lasted for a century and a half, behaved in an outrageous fashion; in 172 a plebeian pair of consuls took office, likewise in 171. These pernicious tendencies, however, soon abated. The consuls charged with the conduct of military operations in the first two campaigns of the Macedonian war, P. Licinius Crassus and A. Hostilius Mancinus (171 and 170 BC), were signal failures. A reaction set in, and the older families exploited it. The consuls of 169 BC were Q. Marcius Philippus (*cos.* I, 186 BC) and Cn. Servilius Caepio. Men could recall that Philippus' military command in his first consulate had been attended by a defeat;²⁸ and Philippus, it must be conceded, was not happier in Macedonia than his predecessors. But in that year Paullus was elected to terminate the war. It is an attractive theory that he was the chosen candidate of a coalition of the older families, the patrician element being preponderant.²⁹

What in fact was [the] capacity and reputation of Paullus? M. Lepidus the *pontifex maximus*, alert and successful, continued to profit from the alliance with Fulvii and Manlii: he soon got a second consulate (175 BC). Paullus was left out in the cold. He let it frequently be known that he was willing to be considered, and actually put forward his candidature.³⁰ In vain. Paullus thereupon consecrated his enforced leisure to the ostentatious care of religion and the family.³¹ Paullus was an augur, [8] skilled and zealous in devotion,³² impelled perhaps to emulate and outshine the *pontifex maximus*. The relations between the two Aemilii, never close, may have passed from estrangement to enmity.

Plutarch mentions Paullus' fruitless aspirations for a second consulate. This is omitted in the tradition which Livy follows. The virtues of Paullus might appear to have destined him for the censorship. Neither author records a candidature in 174 BC, when a Fulvius and a Postumius secured the office; nor is the name of Paullus among the numerous candidates in 169 BC. Perhaps he knew better than to incur the disgrace of a certain defeat. Despite the eager testimony of Plutarch,³³ it is clear that he was anything but a popular character. Nor had his campaigns in Spain and in Liguria, though respectable, displayed any conspicuous military talent. Not for the first or for the last time in the history of Rome a frugal disciplinarian got more credit than was due—one thinks of the Emperor Galba.³⁴ But Paullus, unlike Galba, demonstrated that he

²⁷ Of patricians who held the praetorship in the years 178–171 BC only one, Cn. Servilius Caepio, was able to achieve the consulate. Yet there were a dozen of them.

²⁸ Livy 39.20.1–10.

²⁹ Compare the arguments of Münzer, *RA* 152–4.

³⁰ Plut. *Aem.* 6.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Aem.* 3; cf. 17: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ πολὺ νέμων, καὶ φιλοθύτης ὢν καὶ μαντικός ['he was very devout to the god, and given to sacrifices and divination'].

³³ *Ibid.* 38: σπουδαζόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τιμώμενον διαφερόντως ['he was admired and lavishly honoured by the people'].

³⁴ Tac. *Hist.* 1.49.

was *capax imperii*. Pydna was a splendid victory; and the figure of the grey-haired general, passing through or along the ranks, was enthusiastically commemorated. But nobody has been able to explain precisely what movements brought the Macedonian phalanx to battle and to ruin. We are left with the verdict of Livy—*fortuna, quae plus consiliis humanis pollet, contraxit certamen*.³⁵

The election of the sexagenarian Paullus to a second consulate is clearly to be explained by political alliances and combinations, not by a tardy recognition of personal merit and military genius. [10] Plutarch speaks of spontaneous popular agitation in his favour.³⁶ This will be doubted. But Plutarch in the same context mentions the serried ranks of his kinsmen and powerful political allies.³⁷ That is more to the point. There is evidence in support. The role of Cn. Servilius Caepio, the patrician consul who presided at the elections in 169 BC, may have been very important.³⁸ Servilii and Aemilii had been in alliance more than once before now, and it was a Servilius (though a member of the branch which had recently passed over to the plebs) who defended Paullus with forceful eloquence when his enemies impugned his claims to a triumph after Pydna.³⁹ Perhaps there was in this generation some link of blood or marriage between the two *gentes*.⁴⁰ Through the Fabii a connection can certainly be established. The line of Fabius Maximus was verging towards extinction. It was saved by the Aemilii and the Servilii. Q. Fabius Maximus (*pr.* 181 BC) took in adoption the eldest sons of Paullus and of Cn. Caepio—the men known to historical records as Q. Fabius Aemilianus (*cos.* 145 BC) and Q. Fabius Servilianus (*cos.* 142 BC).⁴¹

But it was especially to the Scipionic connection that Paullus, the brother-in-law of Africanus, remained loyal. The second son of Papiria was adopted by P. Scipio the *flamen Dialis*, son of Africanus, himself unfitted for public life. He presumably died young.⁴² Aemilianus along with his brother Fabius and the sons-in-law of Paullus, Cato, and Tubero, were present at Pydna,⁴³ and P. Scipio Nasica, who married a daughter of Africanus, took an important part in the campaign.⁴⁴ It was quite a family party. The Macedonian [11] war

³⁵ Livy 44.40.3 ['fortune, which prevails over human schemes, brought about a battle'].

³⁶ Plut. *Aem.* 10.

³⁷ *Ibid.*: πεφραγμένος δὲ κηδεσταῖς καὶ παισὶ νεανίαις καὶ φίλων πλήθει καὶ συγγενῶν μέγα δυναμένων, οἱ πάντες αὐτὸν ὑπακούσαι καλοῦντι τῷ δήμῳ πρὸς τὴν ὑπατείαν ἐπειθον ['surrounded by youthful sons and sons-in-law, and with a crowd of friends and relatives of great influence, all of whom urged him to give ear to the people, which was summoning him to the consulship'].

[4] ³⁸ Cf. Münzer, *RA* 152–53. Münzer (*ibid.* 154) supposes that Caepio was put in to secure the election of Paullus for the next year.

³⁹ Livy 45.35.5–39; Plut. *Aem.* 30–2.

⁴⁰ This is vaguely hinted by Münzer, *RA* 154.

⁴¹ The precise dates of these adoptions cannot be established.

⁴² Münzer places the adoption about 178 BC (*RA* 167). This may be too early. It may fall as late as 170 BC, at the time of the formation of the coalition that brought Paullus to the consulate.

⁴³ Plut. *Aem.* 21, 22, 37, 38; cf. Livy 44.35.14; 45.7.1.

⁴⁴ Plut. *Aem.* 15–18, cf. Livy 44.35.14; 36.9 etc.

reveals a revival of the Scipionic faction, in alliance with Fabii and Servilii—and even with Cato, the bitter enemy of Scipio Africanus. The surviving evidence, though scanty, is significant. There were other links and ties that have escaped record.⁴⁵

The identity of Paullus' second wife, highly relevant to these political combinations, still evades detection. A casual detail preserved by Plutarch may help. When Scipio Aemilianus was canvassing for the censorship, Ap. Claudius Pulcher, noticing that his enemy was encompassed by a troop of ignoble persons of servile extraction, indignantly called upon the name of the aristocratic Paullus—'his unworthy son was being commended by Aemilius the herald and Licinius Philonicus'.⁴⁶ Aemilius is clearly meant to be a freedman of Paullus, inherited by Aemilianus along with the fortune of his father. What of the freedman Licinius? How does a freed slave of the Licinii come to be mentioned? All is in order if Paullus' second wife was a Licinia. If so, precisely who? Of the allies of Scipio Africanus, one of the most important was that remarkable character P. Licinius Crassus Dives, the *pontifex maximus*, who was his colleague in the consulate (205 BC). Some have suspected a connection of blood or marriage between Crassus and the Scipiones.⁴⁷ Crassus died at the beginning of the year 183 BC (about the same time as Africanus).⁴⁸ His son adopted one of the sons of P. Mucius Scaevola (*cos.* 175 BC) and so became the father of P. Licinius Crassus Mucianus (*cos.* 131 BC), also *pontifex maximus*, a character of some note in the political [12] movement associated with the name of the tribune Ti. Gracchus.⁴⁹ If Crassus had a daughter, she was a splendid match: her husband would inherit most of the influence (and some of the property) of her father, for the son of Crassus, not having even reached the praetorship, was of minor

⁴⁵ The son of Livius Aemilianus (see n. 14) might have been expected to be present at Pydna along with his coevals Scipio Aemilianus and Fabius Aemilianus. His name is not mentioned. Perhaps an estrangement had supervened, Paullus not having received in this period of difficulties the support which he had expected from C. Livius Salinator (*cos.* 188 BC), who had adopted his brother. Nor do any Aemilii Lepidi figure in the record. Other connections, however, may have existed. No marriage of a Fabia or a Servilia happens to be attested in this period; and Paullus may have had other sisters, not merely the Aemilia who married Africanus: one authority calls her Aemilia Tertia (Valerius Maximus, 6.7.1). No family link with Q. Marcius Philippus (*cos.* 186, *cos.* II 169) is recorded.

⁴⁶ Plut. *Aem.* 38: ὡς οὖν ἐμβάλλοντος εἰς ἀγορὰν τοῦ Σκιπίωνος κατεῖδε παρὰ πλευρὰν ὁ Ἄππιος ἀνθρώπους ἀγενεῖς καὶ δεδουλευκότας, ἀγοραῖους δὲ καὶ δυναμένους ὄχλον συναγαγεῖν καὶ σπουδαρχία καὶ κραυγὴ πάντα πράγματα βιάσασθαι, μέγα βοήσας ὧ Παῦλε, εἶπεν Ἀἰμίλιε, στέναξον ὑπὸ γῆς, αἰσθόμενος ὅτι σου τὸν υἱὸν Αἰμίλιος ὁ κῆρυξ καὶ Λικίνιος Φιλόνικος ἐπὶ τιμητείαν κατὰγουσιν' ['When, therefore, Appius saw Scipio rushing into the forum attended by men of low birth and freedmen, who were frequenters of the forum, able to gather a mob and force all issues by means by canvassing and shouting, he exclaimed with a loud voice: "Paulus Aemilius, groan beneath the earth when you learn that Aemilius the crier and Licinius Philonikos are escorting your son to the censorship"'].
⁴⁷ Münzer, RA 190. ⁴⁸ Livy 39.46.1–2.

[5] ⁴⁹ Compare, above all, Münzer, RA 257–70; RE XIII, no. 72, 334–8.

importance.⁵⁰ It has been demonstrated that the second marriage of Paullus belongs about this time. If he chose a Licinia, daughter of the opulent and influential *pontifex maximus*, he asserted thereby the Scipionic connection and did no harm to his material prospects.

The argument still holds if Paullus' bride was another Licinia, a niece. The son of the *pontifex maximus* presumably died young. But the two nephews of Crassus reached the consulate. The elder, P. Licinius Crassus (*cos.* 171 BC), elected as consul in the second purely plebeian pair, at a time when the aristocracy does not appear to have been dominant, did not, it is true, improve the prospects of the Licinii by his command in Macedonia. Disgrace followed failure—he was fined by the Senate for his conduct towards certain Greek communities.⁵¹ None the less, when the aristocratic coalition is able to enforce the election of Paullus, the younger brother, C. Licinius Crassus, turns up as his colleague in 168 BC.

The aristocratic and patrician coalition of Aemilii, Scipiones, Fabii, and Servilii was not strong enough to survive; and the Gracchan movement may be regarded as a split in the Scipionic party, for Ti. Gracchus was a grandson of Africanus, and his sister Sempronia was married to Scipio Aemilianus. In their marriages the Scipiones seem generally to have set especial store upon the tie [13] of consanguinity.⁵² If the second wife of Aemilianus' father was in fact a Licinia, nearly related to P. Licinius Crassus Mucianus (*cos.* 131 BC), the family nexus in these momentous transactions becomes even closer. Mucianus had chosen Gracchus' brother as husband for his daughter.

To resume. It appears that Paullus made a divorce for political reasons, certainly in the period 184–182 BC, perhaps early in 183 BC. The new match was advantageous. Antiquarians and moralists were in the habit of asserting that the first Roman to divorce his wife was Sp. Carvilius Maximus Ruga (*cos.* 234 BC). Presumably, indeed certainly, an exaggeration. Carvilius passed into repetitive history and anecdote, perhaps because of the frankness of the reason he gave: she was barren, whereas he had taken an oath before the censors that he had married for the purpose of procreation.⁵³ Paullus had no such excuse. It will be regretted, for the sake of historical equity, that Paullus does not stand where Carvilius does, prominent in the accepted canon of deviations from the primitive sanctity of Roman public and private life. On a cool estimate, the divorce of Aemilius Paullus provides an instructive commentary on the habits of the dynastic families of the Roman nobility in their great age, precisely those families which were held to be blameless and exemplary.

⁵⁰ Indeed, the son is not a person but a name, deduced from the nomenclature of P. Licinius P. f. P. n. Crassus Mucianus, *cos.* 131 BC (compare Drusus Aemilianus, father of C. Livius Drusus, *cos.* 147 BC, see n. 14). Mucianus' career was very slow: he was probably born about 180 BC. His presumed adoptive father P. Crassus either died young or held the praetorship after 167 BC.

⁵¹ Livy *Per.* 43; Zonar. 9.22.

⁵² Münzer, RA 101–2.

⁵³ Gell. NA 17.21.44 etc.

The son of Aemilius Paullus, however, was a shining exception. When his aunt Aemilia died, he gave a part of her estate to the distressed Papiria. A tardy reparation. The generosity of Aemilianus is commended by Polybius, who observes that no Roman ever gave anything for nothing.⁵⁴ Aemilius Paullus was one of those Romans.

⁵⁴ Plb. 31.26.9: *Τοῦτο δὲ πανταχῇ μὲν ἂν εἰκότως φαίνοιτο καλόν, ἐν δὲ Ῥώμῃ καὶ θαυμαστόν· ἀπλῶς γὰρ οὐδεὶς οὐδενὶ δίδωσι τῶν ἰδίων ὑπαρχόντων ἑκὼν οὐδέν* ['Such conduct would of course be deemed good anywhere, but in Rome it was also a marvel; for absolutely no one there ever willingly gives away anything to anyone'].

The Predominance of the Fulvii

[1] Of the dynastic houses of the plebeian nobility, the Caecilii Metelli seem to have usurped the most enduring notoriety, for various reasons. Their menacing reply to the poet Naevius was once known even to schoolboys—*malum dabunt Metelli Naevio poetae*.¹ Merit or numbers won them high and easy honours: the days of their prime saw six Metelli consuls in fifteen years. Finally, they enjoyed prominence and repute in the last epoch of the Republic, heavily emphasised when the heir of the Scipiones passed by adoption into their family, namely Q. Metellus Scipio (*cos.* 52 BC).²

Yet other plebeian *gentes*, such as the Marcii, had more illustrious origin, or, breaking at an earlier date into the ranks of the *nobilitas*, were able to stay there longer. Indeed, one great house, the Fulvii, impressed its name no fewer than twenty times on the consular Fasti, a total not equalled even by the Metelli.

Four of these consulates, it is true, were held by one man. But, apart from that distinction, the Fulvii show a consistent record of political success, with consulates in every generation for two hundred years (322–125 BC). Pride and violence stamp them as a family—wherefore some compare them to the patrician Claudii, with whom their destinies became entangled.³ The last Fulvian consul perished in armed opposition to the magistrates of the Roman State; the orators or annalists of Rome seldom spoke with honour of the Fulvian name; and their latest descendants were, for the most part, a sorry crew.⁴

Some of the powerful *gentes* of the new nobility derived from ancient dynasties in the towns of Latium. Tusculum was especially renowned as a breeding place of consuls;⁵ and from Tusculum came the Fulvii, not to mention the Mamilii of regal ancestry, and certain families of inferior

[1] ¹ Namely 123–109 BC. [On the Naevius anecdote see Caesius Bassus, *GL* 6.266.7 and ps.-Asc. 215 Stangl.]

² Cf. *RR* 40, etc. [45, 50].

³ So Münzer, *RA* 412. The Fulvii, however, show hardly a trace of the religious and literary accomplishments of the Claudii.

⁴ See below [the end of the essay], and [‘The End of the Fulvii’].

⁵ See Cic. *Planc.* 19.

estimation.⁶ Of the founder of their nobility, L. Fulvius Curvus, it is related that, being [2] consul at Tusculum, he changed sides when the city rebelled, became consul at Rome, and held a triumph over the Tusculans in the same year (322 BC).⁷ Not all legend, perhaps. It has been conjectured that, although there was no actual war, the Latins were strong enough to impose, or rather Rome was wise enough to accept, a man from Tusculum for consul.⁸ The predominant influence of the great patrician house of the Fabii may also be invoked in explanation.⁹

At Rome, three lines of consular Fulvii can be distinguished. They are represented by M. Fulvius Flaccus (*cos.* 264 BC), the grandson of the first consul, and by the brothers Ser. Paetinus (*cos.* 309 BC) and Cn. Centumalus Maximus (*cos.* 278 BC), from the former of whom derive the Fulvii Nobiliores. The Tusculan families were clearly of some consequence about the beginning of the first war against the Carthaginians. In 264 BC, M. Fulvius Flaccus was consul with Ap. Claudius Caudex; in the next year his elderly kinsman, Cn. Centumalus Maximus, was appointed *dictator clavi figendi causa* [literally: 'dictator in charge of driving the ritual nail']; and the brothers Mamilius, becoming consuls (265 and 263 BC), added nobility at Rome to their local pedigree.

M. Fulvius Flaccus was a person of some note, associated perhaps in his political operations with certain remarkable plebeian *novi homines*. At least, after his tribunate (271 BC), he was chosen to superintend, along with M'. Curius, the construction of a famous aqueduct;¹⁰ and many years later he turns up as *magister equitum* to the great Coruncanius (246 BC). Coruncanius, who came from Tusculum, was the first plebeian *pontifex maximus*.

But the glory of the Fulvian house was his son, Q. Fulvius Flaccus, consul four times (237, 224, 212, 209 BC) and censor (231 BC), the conqueror of Capua. Next to Fabius and Marcellus, he was Rome's best general in the darkest hours of the Hannibalic War. The effigies of Fabius and Marcellus adorn the Roman halls of fame—and consequently qualify as subjects for Plutarchian biographies. Flaccus is left out.

Fabius and Marcellus were described as the shield and the sword of [3] Rome in the war against Hannibal.¹¹ Their characters and their exploits were suitably enhanced by the interested devices of patriotic—and partisan—historians long before Plutarch applied the last coat of paint. In Cicero's account Fabius Maximus is not merely a sound and worthy figure—he exudes

⁶ For example, the Porcii. See further [cross-reference missing].

⁷ Plin. *Nat.* 7.136.

⁸ So Münzer, *RA* 64–5, repenting of his earlier scepticism in *RE* VII, 538.

⁹ So Münzer, *RA* 63. ¹⁰ Frontin. *Aq.* 1.6.

¹¹ Posidonius, quoted by Plut. *Marc.* 9[.4–7 = *FGHist* 87 F 42a, 42b = F 259–60 Edelstein-Kidd], etc. [esp. Plut. *Fab. Max.* 19.1–4].

charm and sincerity;¹² and Marcellus' operations at Nola in 216 BC become the turning point in the war.¹³

But the claims of Flaccus are omitted or contested. The annalists assert that, differing from his colleague Ap. Claudius Pulcher, he behaved with inhuman brutality towards the Campanians, proceeding at once to execute the captives without even opening the despatches from the Senate;¹⁴ and the heroism of a Campanian noble is enhanced or invented to discredit the Roman commander.¹⁵ Yet it appears that the Senate's views about the treatment suitable to the revolting Capuans were in fact even harsher than those of Flaccus.¹⁶

In the course of the Hannibalic War, Q. Flaccus was continuously in high command as a magistrate or by prorogation, for the greater part of a decade (217–207 BC). Though a senior consular, he held the praetorship twice (in 215 and 214 BC). Flaccus was clearly a good soldier and a safe general. Such is the grudging verdict of history. But he was more than that—a skilful politician.

The master of political craft in this generation was beyond doubt Q. Fabius Maximus, an astute and venerable figure. It will be sufficient to notice how he prevented the election of two plebeian consuls in 215 BC, getting one of the places for himself;¹⁷ how he blocked an Aemilius from the consulate of the next year, for his own immediate advantage;¹⁸ how he secured the supreme magistracy for his own incompetent son in 213 BC.¹⁹

Q. Fulvius Flaccus was not dismayed. He had learned all the tricks—and he used them with guile and with success, not provoking the open enmity of Fabius and Marcellus. His skill in promoting himself, his relatives, and his allies soon became evident. The record of elections in the period 213–[4]209 BC is significant and unequivocal.

In this year 213 BC the consul Ti. Gracchus appointed C. Claudius Centho as dictator for holding the elections. The latter then chose as his *magister equitum* Q. Fulvius Flaccus and the election produced as consuls Flaccus and Ap. Claudius Pulcher, the nephew of Centho. The combination kept working. Ap. Claudius held the elections for 211 BC: the consuls were Cn. Fulvius Centumalus and P. Sulpicius Galba. The election of Centumalus, a kinsman of Flaccus, was not justified by any especial claims of military service or military glory.²⁰ Galba had previously held no curule magistracy whatsoever²¹—but the wife of Flaccus was a Sulpicia.²² The next consuls were M. Claudius Marcellus (for the fourth time) and M. Valerius Laevinus:

¹² Cf. especially Cic. *Cat. mai.* 10–12: according to Münzer, *RE* VI, 1830, a 'Phantasiebild'.

¹³ Cf. Münzer, *RE* III, 2740.

¹⁴ Livy 26.15–16.

¹⁵ Livy 26.15.4.

¹⁶ Livy 26.16.4.

¹⁷ Livy 23.31.13–14.

¹⁸ Livy 24.7.12–25.8.

¹⁹ Livy 24.43.5.

²⁰ He was defeated and killed in 210 BC (Livy 27.1.12).

²¹ Livy 25.41.11.

²² She was the daughter of Ser. Sulpicius Paternulus: Val. Max. 8.15.2. Note also C. Sulpicius, praetor in 211 BC (Livy 25.41.12): not necessarily a Sulpicius Galus as assumed in *RE* IVA, 734.

Laevinus was the stepfather of a Fulvius.²³ In this same year Flaccus, being appointed dictator by the consul Marcellus, proceeded to secure his own election, along with Q. Fabius Maximus, to the consulate of 209 BC, despite vigorous protest by certain tribunes of the plebs.²⁴

On the whole a fine performance. It could not have been achieved without allies. Some of these political operations, but hardly all of them, were carried out with the aid, or at least the connivance, of Fabius and Marcellus. For the rest, a nexus of alliances of varying duration and solidity, some recent in origin, some only revealed in the years 215–209 BC. The list of praetors of the year 215 BC is instructive and prophetic.²⁵

A connection with the patrician Claudii, which might have been inferred from the consular pair of 264 BC, is clearly attested by the electoral transactions of 213–212 BC and will be repeatedly confirmed by subsequent history. Further, certain Sempronii show ties with both Fulvii and Claudii.

The different branches of the Sempronii do not seem to have followed any close or consistent policy or family alliances. But the two consulates of Ti. Sempronius Gracchus (215 and 213 BC), were surely relevant to the advance of the Fulvian fortunes; and the consulate of the next Gracchus, his [5] nephew (177 BC), falls in the period of Fulvian dominance (see [below, p. 31–32])—and his colleague was a Claudius.²⁶

In certain epochs of their history the Sempronii Tuditani may be supposed to have cooperated with the Claudii; the Tuditani, consuls in 240 and in 185 BC had Claudii for colleagues.²⁷ Nor is evidence lacking of a link with the Fulvii: P. Sempronius Tuditanus, who had been curule aedile and praetor along with Cn. Fulvius Centumalus, was chosen censor in 209 BC, at elections presided over by Q. Flaccus,²⁸ a remarkable distinction for he had not yet held the consulate.²⁹

Not only that. The next generation will show a palpable combination of Fulvii and Manlii (see [above, p. 18, 20]). It does not appear to have been the result of a sudden reversal of alliances; and its roots may lie some way back. Q. Flaccus had for colleague in his censorship (231 BC) and his second consulate (224 BC) no less a person than T. Manlius Torquatus.³⁰ Apart from old Torquatus, the Manlii are not prominent or successful in this

²³ Plb. 21.29.10–11; Livy 38.9.8. ²⁴ Livy 27.6.2–11.

²⁵ The praetors were Q. Fulvius Flaccus, M. Valerius Laevinus, Ap. Claudius Pulcher, Q. Mucius Scaevola. On the sons of these men, consuls in the period 179–174 BC, see RA 201–10.

²⁶ On the connections of Claudii and Sempronii, see [RA 275].

²⁷ Note also Ap. Pulcher, *cos. suff.* 130 BC, followed by C. Sempronius Tuditanus, on whose political allegiance see [RE II, 2, 2, 1441].

²⁸ Livy 27.11.7.

²⁹ It is true that this Tuditanus (consul in 204 BC) later appears to be a Scipionic partisan, [RA 100].

[2] ³⁰ On the fortunes of the Manlii see RA 202–3.

generation; but two Manlii emerge as praetors during the predominance of the Fulvii (210 BC).³¹

Of presumed or temporary allies in the *nobilitas* will be mentioned the patricians P. Sulpicius Galba and M. Valerius Laevinus. But a Roman dynastic house did not confine its attention to its peers in birth or power. It may be supposed that in these years the Fulvii extended their patronage to certain rising families which had not yet attained to the consulate, such as the Mucii, the Calpurnii—and perhaps the Hostilii.³² Of this, more later.

In all the reciprocations of friendship and enmity, intrigue and allegiance, one thing stands out. The Fulvii were against the Scipionic faction.³³ Like Fabius, the veteran Q. Fulvius Flaccus raised protest in the Senate against Scipio's design of carrying the war into Africa (205 BC).³⁴ This was his last public appearance. The scene and the actors changed quickly. Fabius Maximus died in 203 BC, old Manlius Torquatus in 202 BC. Lacking men of consular rank, the Fulvii can claim no prominence in the interval between [6] the end of the Hannibalic War and the defeat of Antiochus the Great (202–190 BC). Exploiting the victory over Hannibal, Scipio Africanus and his friends are conspicuous but not dominant; and other groups, such as the combination of the Quinctii and the Marcelli, or the compact of L. Valerius Flaccus and the *novus homo* M. Porcius Cato, supported, it may be presumed, by a respectable block of senators, intervened to check the power and rebuff the pretensions of the Scipiones.³⁵

The two brothers of Q. Flaccus had not achieved the supreme magistracy,³⁶ and Cn. Centumalus, who succumbed to a defeat in the field, was the last consul of that line.³⁷ But the Fulvii were numerous enough at this time. The three sons of Q. Flaccus were not yet of an age to put forward their candidature.³⁸ So it happened that a Nobilior (*cos.* 189 BC), whose father had missed the consulate, becomes, for a few years, the leading man in the *gens Fulvia*.

So jealous was the Senate of the exorbitant power of individual nobles, so active were the enemies of the Scipiones, that in the year of apparent Scipionic predominance, with L. Scipio and Laelius as consuls, the year which was to

³¹ Namely P. Manlius Vulso and L. Manlius Acidinus (Livy 26.23.1).

³² On the political affinities of the Sulpicii, see [RA 12, 375; RE II, 4, 1, 732–3].

³³ [Cf. RA 64–6]. ³⁴ Livy 28.45.2–6.

³⁵ See especially W. Schur, *Scipio Africanus und die Begründung der römischen Weltherrschaft* (Leipzig 1927) 62–78, 88–94, 105–41.

³⁶ Namely Cn. Flaccus, *pr.* 212 BC, who was disgraced and exiled in 211 BC (Livy 26.2.7–16; 3) and C. Flaccus, legate in 211 and 209 BC (Livy 26.5.8 and 14.6; 27.8.10).

³⁷ Livy 27.1.12.

³⁸ Observe, besides the three sons of Q. Flaccus (*cos.* [237, 224, 212, 209]), M. Flaccus, *decemvir agris dividendis* in 201 BC (Livy 31.4.3) and *tr. pl.* 199 BC (Livy 32.7.8), Q. Fulvius, *tr. pl.* 197 BC (Livy 32.28.3) and Cn. Fulvius Flaccus, *pr.* 190 BC (Livy 36.45.9; [37.2.6]). Also Q. Fulvius Flaccus, *pr.* 187, *cos. suff.* 180 BC; and M. Fulvius Centumalus, praetor in 192 (Livy 35.10.11), the son of the consul of 211 BC.

witness Africanus' overthrow of King Antiochus at Magnesia, the elections produced a pair of consuls from the opposition, eager to supersede the Scipiones in the eastern lands. The censors chosen this year were also rivals of the Scipiones.³⁹ The new consuls were M. Fulvius Nobilior and Cn. Manlius Vulso. Of the former, praetor in 193 BC, no previous candidature is recorded. But the patrician Manlius had endured two electoral defeats when he contended against L. Quinctius Flaminius and P. Scipio Nasica (192 and 191 BC).⁴⁰ There is no evidence that he had stood for 190 BC—his prospects would not have been favourable.

An alliance of Fulvii and Manlii now existed—how firm and tight it was, one cannot say. The two consuls proceeded to exploit the victory won by a rival party, to adopt its methods and continue its policy. Fulvius went to Greece, Manlius to Asia. Returning in 187 BC, from their commands, each incurred savage criticism from members of the Scipionic party. The consul Lepidus, fired by just and personal resentment against M. Fulvius Nobilior, urged various charges of unequalled gravity.⁴¹ Nobilior was protected by the other consul, C. Flaminius;⁴² and it appears that his proposals for the settlement of Aetolia were in fact moderate, more generous even than the Senate desired. Nor were L. Aemilius Paullus and L. Furius Purpureo more successful when they accused Manlius, among other things, of waging war against the Galatians without the Senate's approval or the People's command.⁴³

Though the enemies of Fulvius and Manlius could not rob them of their triumphs, the glory and the booty acquired by Fulvius and Manlius excited envy and prejudice. Neither seems to have been able in the following years to advance the fortunes of his family, least of all the patrician Manlius, who had two eligible brothers of praetorian rank.⁴⁴ Political strife was keen and confused. The Scipiones are assailed and driven from public life, largely by the will and design of the political group (or groups) of which Cato was the agent: but no action is recorded of the Fulvii or their associates.⁴⁵ However that may be, certain of the allies of the Fulvii prevail in the consular elections, Ap. Claudius Pulcher being consul in 185 BC along with M. Sempronius Tuditanus,

³⁹ Namely T. Quinctius Flaminius and M. Claudius Marcellus. The praetors elected in this year also show no Scipionic complexion—Q. Fabius Labeo, Q. Fabius Pictor, M. Sempronius Tuditanus, Sp. Postumius Albinus, L. Plautius Hypsaesus, L. Baebius Dives (Livy 27.47.8).

⁴⁰ Livy 35.10.2; 24.4.

⁴¹ Livy 38.43.1–6. Nobilior had twice frustrated Lepidus' candidature for the consulate.

⁴² Livy 38.43.7–44.3. There is no evidence of any political or family connection between the Fulvii and the Flaminii in the previous generation.

[3] ⁴³ Livy 38.45.1–49.

⁴⁴ L. Manlius Vulso (*pr.* 197 BC) and A. Manlius Vulso (*pr.* probably in 189, consul subsequently in 178 BC).

⁴⁵ [RA 191–2].

imposing his brother, P. Claudius Pulcher, for the next year; and certain Scipionic partisans such as L. Aemilius Paullus (*pr.* 191 BC), are kept out of the consulate for a long time.⁴⁶

The visible resurgence of the Fulvii dates from 180 BC. One of the consuls, the *novus homo* C. Calpurnius Piso, died opportunely—some said it was poison administered by his wife Hostilia Quarta to clear the way for her own son by her first marriage.⁴⁷ That son, Q. Fulvius Flaccus (*pr.* 187 BC), nephew of Q. Flaccus (*cos.* IV), was elected suffect consul. Hostilia Quarta, it is true, was condemned; another unfortunate incident occurred in this year, the disgrace of the military tribune M. Flaccus.⁴⁸ None the less, [8] the Fulvii sweep forward. The next year reveals a unique consular pair, the other Q. Fulvius Flaccus and his brother, who had passed by adoption into the family of political allies, the Manlii—namely L. Manlius Acidinus Fulvianus (*pr.* 188 BC).⁴⁹ The significant relationship, revealed by the *Fasti Capitolini*, was unknown to the annalists whom Livy followed.

There came a yet more striking manifestation of the sudden predominance of the Fulvii. M. Aemilius Lepidus had twice been defeated in the consular elections through the influence of M. Fulvius Nobilior;⁵⁰ yet in the year 180 BC he was elected *pontifex maximus* and, at the beginning of the next year, censor, with his old enemy Nobilior as colleague. The political compact was artfully arranged and duly made public in an exemplary scene of reconciliation; and, as a sign and seal of the alliance, Nobilior when drawing up the list of the Senate enrolled his fellow-censor as *princeps senatus*, an honour which he was to hold for nearly thirty years.⁵¹

The Aemilii had previously been associated with the Scipionic party.⁵² The alliance of Lepidus with the Fulvii revealed the full measure of his estrangement from his less successful kinsman, L. Aemilius Paullus, his colleague as praetor (191 BC), but long retarded in his efforts to reach the consulate—Lepidus attained that honour in 189 BC, Paullus only in 182. Henceforth Lepidus is closely bound to the enemies of the Scipionic faction.⁵³

The now enlarged combination demonstrated its power in various ways, in the praetorian as well as in the consular elections from the year 180 BC onwards. Of the thirty praetors of the years 185 to 181 BC only five rose to

⁴⁶ See [RA 153–4].

⁴⁷ Livy 40.37.5–7.

⁴⁸ Livy 40.41.8–11. The identity of the victim is not easy to come by. For a careful discussion of this complicated question see Münzer, *RE* VII 240–1.

⁴⁹ He was the son by adoption of L. Manlius Acidinus (*pr.* 210 BC). This is the first recorded case of the adoption of a plebeian by a patrician.

⁵⁰ As is expressly stated by Livy 38.43.1.

⁵¹ Cf. Livy 40.45.6–46, 51.1; Cicero, *De prov. cons.* 20 etc. The true nature of these transactions was demonstrated by Münzer, *RA* 200–1.

⁵² Cf. Münzer, *RA* 162–3.

⁵³ Münzer, *RA* 200–2.

the consulate.⁵⁴ Then abrupt change—of ten praetors in the two years 180 and 179 BC no fewer than eight became consuls.⁵⁵ Some have invoked the *Lex Villia Annalis*, passed in 180 BC—certain of its provisions, not precisely recorded, may have disqualified a number of elderly praetors, or at least discouraged them from further importuning of the electorate. The dominant [9] factor, however, will more naturally be sought in personal and party politics. Most of the praetors of 180 and 179 BC, being allies of the Fulvian party, advanced rapidly to the consulate.

The consulate of the two brothers Fulvius and Manlius Fulvianus in 179 BC embodies the triumph of that faction. The next year saw as consuls A. Manlius Vulso and M. Junius Brutus, whose praetorships lay a decade back, unpromising candidates, it might have seemed.⁵⁶ But the patrician Manlii were now temporarily in the ascendant; and Brutus presumably owed his elevation to the influence of Lepidus. Not merely that they had both been praetors together in 191 BC—the links between Aemilii and Junii went back a long way,⁵⁷ they were again relevant about 137 BC (see [below, p. 39]), and they were reinforced in the last generation of the Republic.

For the next year were elected two of the praetors of the year 180 BC, C. Claudius Pulcher and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus. The Claudii were allies of the Fulvii a generation back; and the uncle of Gracchus had been consul in 215 and 213 BC, about the time when certain of the political alliances now branching out in open day seem to have struck root. The colleagues of 177 BC were later censors together in 169 BC; and, although Ti. Gracchus contracted a marriage alliance with the Scipionic party, it was the alliance with Claudii and Fulvii that prevailed, with fatal results, in the next generation.⁵⁸

A temporary stoppage in the stream of political patronage occurred in 176 BC, but the death of one of the consuls, Cn. Scipio Hispallus, enabled C. Valerius Laevinus, the half-brother of M. Fulvius Nobilior, to be put in as *suffectus*. Then, in 175 BC, the first man in the Roman State, M. Aemilius Lepidus, *princeps senatus* and *pontifex maximus*, was elevated to a second consulate, an honour that had come to nobody since Scipio Africanus (194 BC). The colleague of Lepidus was the *novus homo* P. Mucius Scaevola; and Scaevola's brother Quintus became consul in 174 BC. Their father had been praetor along with the great Fulvius Flaccus in 215 BC.⁵⁹

⁵⁴ Namely A. Postumius Albinus, *pr.* 185, *cos.* 180 BC; P. Cornelius Cethegus, *pr.* 185, *cos.* 181 BC; Sp. Postumius Albinus, *pr.* 183, *cos.* 174 BC; Q. Fulvius Flaccus, *pr.* 182, *cos.* 179 BC; Q. Petillius Spurinus, *pr.* 181, *cos.* 176 BC.

⁵⁵ That is to say, every praetor except A. Cornelius Mammula and C. Maenius, praetors in 180 BC. Of the other eight praetors of this *biennium*, and successful candidates for the consulate, only one, Cn. Scipio Hispallus (*cos.* 176 BC), seems to be entirely outside the Fulvian combination.

⁵⁶ Manlius had been praetor long ago in 189 BC, M. Brutus actually in 191 BC.

[4] ⁵⁷ Cf. Münzer, *RA* 157–9.

⁵⁸ See [*RA* 191–212].

⁵⁹ See n. 25.

[10] But the Fulvian party could not keep up this rate much longer: they were constrained to share their power and influence with other groups. About this time belongs an alliance—or compromise—with the patrician Postumii, who had candidates hungry for honours.⁶⁰ Ill fortune had prevented the Postumii from playing the part they hoped in the war against Hannibal—and in the game of Roman politics. L. Postumius Albinus, elected to hold his third consulate with Ti. Sempronius Gracchus in 215 BC, had been killed by the Gauls in northern Italy. The next consulates of Postumii belong to 186 and 180 BC. When censors were elected for 174 BC, the successful pair was Q. Fulvius Flaccus (*cos.* 179 BC) and A. Postumius Albinus (*cos.* 180 BC); his brothers Sp. Postumius and L. Albinus, praetors respectively in 183 and 180 BC now at last grasped the consulate, in fraternal succession, in 174 and 173 BC. So far their careers had been blocked by the Fulvian combination.

And now emerges yet another pair of brothers, significant in parallel and proximity to the Mucii and Postumii—M. Popillius Laenas (*cos.* 173 BC) and C. Popillius Laenas (*cos.* 172 BC). The Popillii had once been among the most important of the houses of the new nobility. M. Popillius (*cos.* 359 BC) was consul no fewer than four times in the generation following the admission of plebeians to office at Rome.⁶¹ But the Popillii had been absent from the consular *Fasti* ever since 316 BC. Resurgent again from long obscurity, they surpass any patrician in pride, violence, and ruthlessness.

The consulate of the younger Popillius (172 BC) marks a date unique in the history of Rome—for the first time a pair of plebeians at the head of the government. A fact noted by the *Fasti Capitolini* and neglected by the historian Livy. Prejudice against patricians was still alive, likewise impatience with the Senate's control of affairs. It appears to have been exploited by the Fulvii and the Postumii. It was no sudden ebullition of resentment, no accident of political intrigue—the praetorian *Fasti* of the seven years 178–172 BC are significant, showing hardly any patricians.⁶² [11] The tide seemed firmly set. Plebeian pairs of consuls followed in 171 and 170 BC. Then came a reaction, for various reasons. The Fulvian party and their heterogeneous allies are discredited—or at least rebuffed and held in check. A new aristocratic coalition comes to power, and terminating with good fortune the last war against Macedonia, imposes, through the advantage of its success in a national emergency, a brief period of concord—or at least temperance—in Roman politics.⁶³

⁶⁰ Cf., for the reconstruction of the politics of these years, Münzer, *RA* 211–12.

⁶¹ On the early history of the Popillii, cf. Münzer, *RA* 27–30; 33.

⁶² Of the forty praetors of these years only ten are patricians. [Cf. *MRR* 1.395–411, where twelve patrician praetors are listed out of a total of forty-two].

⁶³ See further [cross-reference missing].

The censors of 174 BC, Fulvius and Postumius may—or may not—have operated in the due spirit of harmony described by Livy.⁶⁴ Neither appears to have enhanced his reputation or popularity. The censor Q. Fulvius Flaccus, the head of the Fulvian house, desiring to adorn in splendours one of his own constructions, stripped the tiles from the roof of the famous temple of Juno on the Lacinian promontory. Protest was raised in the Senate, and the censor was compelled to desist the work of desecration.⁶⁵ Two years later he was visited by the vengeance of the angry deity, so they said: he committed suicide by hanging, in a fit of despondency caused by ill news—one of his sons had died in Illyricum and the other was reported grievously ill.⁶⁶ As for the allies of the Fulvii, L. Postumius (*cos.* 173 BC), resentful because the people of Praeneste had not paid him adequate respect when he passed through their city, imposed harsh requisitions on their magistrates, breaking thereby with all precedent, so it was alleged, and inaugurating an evil habit in Rome's relations with all the allies in Italy.⁶⁷ This was nothing to the conduct of the Popillii.⁶⁸ In 173 BC the consul M. Popillius Laenas attacked without pretext or provocation a harmless tribe of Ligurians and sold them into slavery. The Senate objected; but Popillius returned to Rome, ferocious and unrepentant, demanding that the Senate's decree be revoked. Rebuffed, he returned to his province, and was protected by his brother, who in the meantime had become consul. Popillius then massacred some more Ligurians. The Senate sanctioned strong measures. A special commission of enquiry, under the presidency of the praetor C. Licinius Crassus, was set up [12] to investigate. But the Popillii intimidated the praetor and the whole affair was stifled.

So far the enormities of Fulvii, Postumii, and Popillii. It will reasonably be recalled that the transgressions of members of these families are singularly liable to enhancement. Fulvii, Postumii, and Popillii subsequently collapsed or declined as the result of political miscalculations; and they can show no more consuls in the last fifty years of the Roman Republic. Their earlier record was fair game for partisan or artistic elaboration.

Yet, with all the allowances made for the partiality of the tradition, certain of the consuls thrown up by the strong anti-patrician and anti-aristocratic current of these years seem to make a very poor showing. When the war against Perseus had been decided, there arose between the consuls of the year 171 BC an undignified squabble for the province of Macedonia.⁶⁹ P. Licinius Crassus insisted and prevailed, though several years before he had evaded a provincial command of religious scruples.⁷⁰ Crassus achieved nothing; and he was fined by the Senate for his oppressive behaviour towards certain Greek communities.⁷¹ His colleague, C. Cassius Longinus, furious at being robbed

⁶⁴ Livy 42.10.4.

⁶⁵ Livy 42.3.1–11.

⁶⁶ Livy 42.28.11–12.

⁶⁷ Livy 42.1.7–12.

⁶⁸ Livy 42.8–10, 22–3.

⁶⁹ Livy 42.32.1–4.

⁷⁰ Livy 41.15.9–10.

⁷¹ Livy *Per.* 43; Zonar. 9.22.

of command in the war, attempted to lead his legions from northern Italy to Macedonia through the Illyrian lands.⁷² A deputation from the colony of Aquileia apprised the Senate of his rash venture; and subsequently envoys from the Alpine and Illyrian peoples came to protest against his depredations. But Cassius in the meantime had departed to serve in Macedonia with the consul Hostilius, and nothing was done.

Of the consuls of 170 BC, A. Atilius Serranus, the head of an ancient plebeian line now in decay, was, it may be presumed, unobjectionable and harmless. But his colleague A. Hostilius Mancinus appears to belong to the Fulvian party, or at least to have connections with that group.⁷³ Hostilius, who secured the command, was repulsed in his attempt to invade Macedonia. The next elections, however, produced a reassuring pair of consuls, Cn. Servilius [13] Caepio, a patrician, and Q. Marcius Philippus, of ancient nobility, who had already been consul nearly twenty years before (186 BC). Philippus, it is true, achieved no striking successes in Macedonia; but his colleague held the elections at Rome, and the elderly L. Aemilius Paullus was chosen consul, the man designated by the nobility to terminate the Macedonian war.⁷⁴ Behind the scenes an aristocratic coalition had grown up, representing a renaissance of the Scipionic party, grouped around Paullus and his relations by blood or marriage and including the patrician houses of the Fabii and the Servilii. Pydna was their victory as well as Rome's.⁷⁵

The Fulvii, it has been shown, were compelled to take the Postumii and Popillii into partnership. How close was the alliance, it cannot be said.⁷⁶ It will be noted, however, that whereas the Fulvii take no great part in eastern affairs at this time, the Postumii were conspicuous in diplomatic missions of high import; M. Popillius, though a consular, served as a military tribune under Philippus in Macedonia;⁷⁷ L. Postumius led a legion at Pydna against the enemy's centre;⁷⁸ and C. Popillius, active and arrogant as an envoy of the imperial Republic, rebuked the people of Rhodes with angry demeanour,⁷⁹ and extorted an immediate and humble reply from the King of Syria.⁸⁰ These recent associates of the Fulvii were eager to maintain their prominence, atone for past derelictions—and exploit the patriotic policy of national union against the Macedonian enemy.

The Fulvii themselves were in eclipse. Whatever be thought of the sacrilege of the censor Q. Flaccus, his death was a heavy blow to the party. The other Q. Flaccus (*cos. suff.* 180 BC), a person of slight value, and M. Nobilior, the

⁷² Livy 43.1.4–11.

⁷³ Cf. n. 47 for Hostilia Quarta, the mother of Q. Fulvius Flaccus (*cos. suff.* 180 BC). She might not be a member of the Hostilii Mancini—there were also the Catones and the Tubuli.

⁷⁴ See, for the elucidation of these transactions, Münzer, *RA* 152–4. ⁷⁵ [*RA* 145–56.]

⁷⁶ Cf. Münzer, *RA* 215.

⁷⁷ Livy 44.1.2.

⁷⁸ Livy 44.41.2.

⁷⁹ Livy 45.10.8–10.

⁸⁰ Livy 45.12.5–6.

conqueror of the Aetolians, were also dead by now.⁸¹ There was no man of consular rank to lead the party, to acquire new allies of mutual benefit. Certain Fulvii whose existence is attested at this time came nowhere near the consulate;⁸² and the next Fulvian consuls appear to have suffered retardation on their career (see [below, p. 38, 39]).

[14] Nor was Pydna and its aftermath a bright period for the oldest and closest allies of the Fulvii. C. Valerius Laevinus, the stepbrother of Nobilior, was an unsuccessful candidate for the censorship in 169 BC and is not heard of afterwards.⁸³ Nor did his brother Marcus reach the consulate.⁸⁴ The Manlii, despite their three consulates (189, 179, 178), do not appear subsequently to have played any considerable rôle in politics: none of the three are heard of after 170 BC. Indeed, the line of the Manlii Vulsones never rises to the consulate again; and its last recorded member is a stupid and ridiculous figure.⁸⁵ The Manlii, however, did not forfeit their rank: two Manlii of another branch, the grandsons of T. Manlius Torquatus (*cos.* 235, *cos.* II 224 BC) achieve the consulate in succession in 165 and 164 BC, after which the *gens* plunges into obscurity for a century. No evidence illustrates the capacity or the political allegiance of those two Manlii.

Of the three Claudian brothers, the elder two were presumably dead by now.⁸⁶ The youngest, however, C. Claudius Pulcher, praetor (180 BC) and consul (177 BC) in the years of Fulvian predominance, served as military tribune in the army of P. Crassus in Macedonia⁸⁷ and became censor with Ti. Sempronius Gracchus in 167 BC.

So far the patrician allies of the Fulvii, namely Valerii, Manlii, and Claudii. If the Sulpicii Galbae belong properly here (see [below, p. 42]), it will be pertinent to mention the attempt made by Ser. Sulpicius Galba (subsequently consul in 144 BC) to stir up ill feeling against L. Aemilius Paullus and frustrate his triumph.⁸⁸

Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, it will be presumed, balanced delicately his allegiance to the Fulvio-Claudian party and his connection with the family of the Scipiones:⁸⁹ after his censorship with a Claudius he acquired a second consulate in 163 BC.⁹⁰ About attachments among the families newly ennobled, Calpurnii, Mucii, and Hostilii there is no significant evidence at this time.

⁸¹ [RE VII, 1, 246, no. 60 and 267, no. 91].

⁸² Namely, M. Flaccus, attested as *legatus* in 171 and 170 BC (Livy 43.1.12; 11.2; [11.9–11]); Cn. Flaccus, *pr.* 167 BC (Livy. 45.16.3) and Q. Fulvius, chosen as *epulo* in 180 BC (Livy 40.42.11).

⁸³ Livy 43.14.1.

⁸⁴ He was praetor in 182 BC (Livy 39.56.5; [40.1.1–2, 4, 7]). Nothing is known of any magistracies held by the third brother, P. Laevinus (Livy 31.50.4).

⁸⁵ Cf. esp. Livy, *Epit. Oxyrh.* l. 113: L. Manlius Vulso *stolidus*.

⁸⁶ [RE III, 2, 2847–8, no. 294 and 2858, no. 305].

⁸⁷ Livy 45.17.2: he died in 167 BC (Livy 45.44.3).

⁸⁸ Livy 45.35.8–[11].

⁸⁹ See [RA 193].

[5]⁹⁰ See [MRR I, 440].

Indeed, for twenty years and more after the battle of Pydna, Roman [15] politics are dark and mysterious. Some light comes with the rise of Scipio Aemilianus (*cos.* 147 BC), the consequent disturbance of equilibrium, and the activities of his enemies, so that it becomes possible, though hazardous, to reconstruct the alignment of parties before the resurgence of the Fulvio-Claudian party and the momentous tribunate of Ti. Gracchus (133 BC).⁹¹ There is little to go upon save the names that occupy the consular *Fasti*, clear testimony of political success, through the antecedent combinations and intrigues, which excite speculation, will forever baffle certainty.

Some of the associates of the Fulvii perished or modified their allegiance to fit the changing seasons. But the *princeps senatus*, M. Aemilius Lepidus, survived until 152 BC. Nobody ever held that eminence so long. It will be conjectured that the influence of Lepidus was still a powerful factor—and that it promoted the return of the Fulvii.⁹²

In 159 BC M. Fulvius Nobilior, the eldest son of the conqueror of Aetolia, became consul, with a certain Cn. Cornelius Dolabella, otherwise unknown. But this is not the most exciting phenomenon. The Popillii turn up again, their sins forgotten or palliated by political compacts. One of the censors of this year is M. Popillius Laenas (*cos.* 173 BC); and the next year registers a significant pair of consuls—the younger Popillius, holding that honour for the second time, along with an Aemilius Lepidus. The combinations of the seventies are working again. Submerged the Fulvian faction may have been: it had not been extinguished. It would be tempting to seek the other evidence of its operations—such as perhaps the election for the next year of Sex. Julius Caesar, of an ancient patrician family that had not seen the consulate for centuries.⁹³

The Popillii, it is evident, are still active, for good or for evil. They achieve two further consulates, in 131 and 130 BC, perhaps, but not certainly, in the same political combination as before.⁹⁴ Like the Popillii are the patrician Postumii—their rôle is also highly enigmatic. Three Postumii become consuls, in close succession, in 154, 151, and 148 BC. Upon the [16] consulate of L. Postumius Albinus (154 BC) follows that of the younger brother of the Fulvian consul of 159 BC, Q. Fulvius Nobilior, whose career had been considerably retarded.⁹⁵ Speculation is dangerous. Yet there may be some arrangement here, if not alliance, between Fulvii and Postumii—and the consuls of 152 BC, namely L. Valerius Flaccus and M. Claudius Marcellus, might for the moment have entered the same political combination. At least that hypothesis would help to elucidate the series of consulates in the period 155–151 BC.

⁹¹ See [RA 225–57]. ⁹² Cf. Münzer, RA 237.

⁹³ The younger son of this consul, L. Caesar, married a Popillia, cf. Cic. *De or.* 2.12; *Dom.* 114.

⁹⁴ See [RA 216–17].

⁹⁵ He had been *triumvir* charged with founding colonies long ago, in 184 BC (Livy 39.44.10; Cic. *Brut.* 79).

Whatever be the explanation, the resurgence of the Fulvii, Postumii, and Marcelli is notable.

Scipio Aemilianus, his allies and his enemies now begin to dominate the political scene; and when a Claudius, a powerful individual, becomes consul (143 BC), the situation seems clearer.⁹⁶ The Fulvio-Claudian party can soon be distinguished again, with relations and alliances that recall the Fulvian predominance of thirty years before, not to mention a certain period of the Hannibalic War. In so far as concerns the history and composition of the Fulvian party in its narrower sense, without invoking all the enemies of the Scipiones, all the friends of the Claudii, all the associates of the Gracchi, the following facts are illuminating.

In 137 BC, M. Aemilius Lepidus Porcina, probably a son of the *princeps senatus*, was elected consul, along with C. Hostilius Mancinus. The latter was a nephew of the *novus homo* who became consul of 170 BC.⁹⁷ As for Porcina, it is recorded that he was a kinsman of his predecessor in the consulate, D. Junius Brutus.⁹⁸ The father of Brutus had attained that honour with the help of the Fulvian party (178 BC); and subsequent connections of Aemilii and Junii are significant.⁹⁹

In 136 BC the censorial pair was Claudio-Fulvian—Ap. Claudius Pulcher (*cos.* 143 BC) and Q. Fulvius Nobilior (*cos.* 153 BC). Nobilior, passing over the most illustrious Roman of the day, Scipio Aemilianus, nominated his colleague as *princeps senatus*.

[17] It is patent that in these years Aemilianus and his friends, despite the Scipionic prestige and family alliances, were not able to control the consulate. Aemilianus was chosen consul for 134 BC to terminate the *Bellum Numantinum*—a definite task, a military object. For the rest, his adversaries dominate the Comitia, not only in the elections for 135–133 BC, but even afterwards for three or four years, when, it would seem, they should have been discredited by the catastrophe of the tribune Ti. Gracchus. Gracchus was put up by the Fulvian faction, especially by the group around Ap. Pulcher and the brothers Mucius Scaevola.¹⁰⁰

The censorship of 136 BC demonstrated the influence of the Fulvii: it is confirmed by the elections of the years following. Two Fulvii hold the consulate in succession, Ser. Fulvius Flaccus in 135, C. Fulvius in 134 BC. The former fought against the Ardiaei in Illyricum, the latter against the slaves in Sicily. Neither reached the consulate at an early age, and neither is mentioned again.¹⁰¹ One Fulvius Flaccus, it is true, comes into the story of the tribunate

⁹⁶ See [RA 240–1]. ⁹⁷ On whom see n. 73.

⁹⁸ App. *Iber.* 80, cf. Münzer, RA 238–9. ⁹⁹ See [RA 157–8, 311].

¹⁰⁰ See esp. Münzer, RA 257–70; and H. Last, 'Tiberius Gracchus', *CAH IX* (Cambridge 1932) 1–39, at 21–2.

¹⁰¹ Ser. Fulvius Flaccus was probably an elderly candidate for the consulate, to judge by the position where he is mentioned by Cic. *Brut.* 81.

of Ti. Gracchus, namely the consular Fulvius who, along with M. Manilius (*cos.* 149 BC) urged him not to persist in the attempt to depose his colleague Octavius: this is probably the aged ex-censor Q. Fulvius Nobilior (*cos.* 153 BC).¹⁰² The tribune's behaviour was certainly of a kind to alarm some of the leading men in the Fulvio-Claudian party. M. Fulvius Flaccus (*cos.* 125 BC), however, is expressly recorded as a friend of Ti. Gracchus.

There is no doubt of the sentiments and allegiances of the Mucii, the sons of the consul of 175 BC, P. Mucius Scaevola (*cos.* 133 BC) and P. Licinius Crassus Mucianus (*cos.* 131 BC); and the *novus homo* M. Perperna (*cos.* 130 BC) is a definite adherent of the Claudii,¹⁰³ who were able to enforce the election of one of their family as *consul suffectus* in 130 BC.¹⁰⁴ And even C. Sempronius Tuditanus (*cos.* 129 BC), though in his consulate he turned against the Gracchan land-commission, may have been an adherent of the Fulvii and Claudii, as certain earlier connections might suggest.¹⁰⁵

[18] In the period of Fulvian influence, two Calpurnii are consuls, colleagues respectively of Ser. Flaccus in 135 BC and of P. Mucius in 133 BC. The relations of P. Mucius with the Fulvii and Claudii go back one generation, if not two. What of the Calpurnii Pisones? The first senator of that name was praetor in 211 BC; the first consul (180 BC) was husband of a Hostilia and stepfather of a Fulvius.¹⁰⁶ The prominence of the Pisones is mysterious. Neither was responsible for any political activity in his consulate—the one went to Spain, where he fought with no success against the people of Numantia, the other to Sicily.¹⁰⁷ C. Piso is not heard of afterwards; L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (*tr. pl.* 149 BC, *cos.* 133 BC) was a person of some note.¹⁰⁸ In the course of fifteen years (148–133 BC) no fewer than four members of that *gens* were consuls.¹⁰⁹ Their colleagues are instructive and perhaps significant, namely Sp. Postumius Albinus (148 BC), M. Popillius Laenas (139 BC), Ser. Fulvius Flaccus (135 BC), P. Mucius Scaevola (133 BC). This collocation of *gentilicia* inevitably recalls the political combination of the seventies. A Postumius and a Popillius will be noted as colleague of these consular Pisones. For the rest, Postumii and Popillii remain enigmatic. No Postumius is mentioned as a partisan on either side in the Gracchan disturbances. Some said, it is true, that emulation of the distinction of a Sp. Postumius, a man of his own age, spurred Ti. Gracchus to political action.¹¹⁰ This person will be identified with Sp. Postumius Albinus, subsequently consul in 110 BC. But the anecdote casts

¹⁰² Plut. *Tib. Gracch.* 11: *Μάλλιος καὶ Φούλβιος ἄνδρες ὑπατικοὶ* ['Mallius and Fulvius, consular men']. That Plutarch does not describe this Fulvius as an ex-censor is not a material objection (*contra*, Münzer, *RE* VII, 269). Note that T. Annius Luscus, the colleague of Q. Nobilior in the consulate, also spoke against Ti. Gracchus (Plut. *Tib. Gracch.* 14).

¹⁰³ Cf. Münzer, *RA* 95–7.

¹⁰⁴ [MRR 1.502].

¹⁰⁵ See n. 27.

¹⁰⁶ See n. 47.

¹⁰⁷ He is not heard of after his consulate.

¹⁰⁸ He was subsequently censor [120 BC: MRR 1.523].

¹⁰⁹ Namely in 148, 139, 135, and 133 BC.

¹¹⁰ Plut. *Tib. Gracch.* 8.

no light on the political affinities or activities of the Postumii. One of the Popillii was consul in 139 BC with that dim figure, Cn. Calpurnius Piso; his cousin, P. Popillius Laenas, consul with P. Rupilius in 132 BC, earned notoriety and subsequent exile by the harshness with which he persecuted the partisans of Ti. Gracchus. Rupilius was certainly an adherent of the Scipionic faction;¹¹¹ and it has been conjectured that this pair of consuls was elected in conscious opposition to Ti. Gracchus, at a time when the tribune had revealed his passionate recklessness.¹¹² It is not proved, however, [19] that Popillius was not a renegade from the group supporting the Gracchi, as Tuditanus (*cos.* 129 BC) may have been—as C. Fannius (*cos.* 122 BC) certainly was.¹¹³

As has been stated, down to 129 BC, the consular *Fasti* provide no indication that the influence of the enemies of the Scipiones was impaired. Two of the Claudio-Fulvian group were dead, Ap. Claudius Pulcher, the *princeps senatus*, and Crassus Mucianus, the *pontifex maximus*. But the Fulvian name was adequately represented in Roman politics by M. Fulvius Flaccus, who succeeded to a place on the agrarian commission.¹¹⁴

Scipio Aemilianus died in 129 BC and the interval before the first tribunate of C. Crassus (123 BC) is obscure, only lit up, if that word may be used, by the agitation to extend the franchise to the Roman allies in the consulate of M. Flaccus (125 BC), and the consequent revolt of the Latin colony of Fregellae.

Mysterious also is that last ill-fated consul of the Fulvian house. It is probable, but not certain, that he was the son of that M. Fulvius Flaccus who incurred disgrace as military tribune in 180 BC.¹¹⁵ If so, a personal grudge against the Senate was added to the traditional spirit of Fulvian violence. Some speak of him as the evil genius of C. Gracchus. The truth is not to be had. But one thing is clear. Whereas tradition preserves some record of the virtues of C. Gracchus, extolled from time to time by partisan—or opportunistic—oratory, no mercy attends upon the memory of M. Fulvius Flaccus. Similarly, beyond all question of praise or censure, history (or rather that biography which passes for history) concentrates all interest upon the figures of the two Gracchi, neglecting the powerful individuals or influential factions that stand behind their political operations. Something, indeed, is known of the supporters of the elder brother, but the scene soon darkens.¹¹⁶ It is difficult to reconstruct the political situation—and among other things, to ascertain who were personal adherents and political [20] allies of the Fulvii in the last fight for power.

The ambition and perhaps the personal resentment of Ti. Gracchus, who was a grandson of Africanus, sowed discord in the ranks of the Scipionic party and won strength for the Fulvio-Claudian faction; and the group in its turn

¹¹¹ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 69; 73. See further [cross-reference missing]. ¹¹² Cf. Münzer, *RA* 259.

¹¹³ Plut. *C. Gracch.* 8.

¹¹⁴ See [*RA* 258].

¹¹⁵ See n. 48.

¹¹⁶ See [*RA* 257–70].

was shaken and weakened by the disastrous outcome of the tribunate of Ti. Gracchus.

Of the Fulvii themselves, the recent consuls of 135 and 134 BC, no trace is preserved in Roman internal politics. As for the allies and associates of fifty years before, the Manlii count no more; silence envelops the Postumii; one Mucius, namely Licinius Mucianus, was dead, his brother, a cautious person, had probably repented of the prominence into which he had reluctantly been thrown in 133 BC; others, like the Popillii, had changed sides or abated their enthusiasm (so perhaps D. Junius Brutus, *cos.* 138 BC); the consular Calpurnii Pisones appear to take no active part in politics, save for one of them, who opposed certain measures of C. Gracchus; and the Hostilii were of no name after the disgrace of Mancinus' capitulation to the Numantines.

Enquiry is reduced to inference and guesswork. Some families that lapse from the consulate after the Gracchan troubles—or are later conspicuous in opposition to the rule of the oligarchy (especially in the time of Marius)—may have been adherents of the Fulvian party. Nor do the consular *Fasti* of the years 129–123 BC provide much guidance. Indeed, of three consuls in 128–126 BC, nothing but the name is known. Yet something can be discovered. When Fulvius Flaccus became consul in 125 BC, his colleague was M. Plautius Hypsaeus, sprung from an ancient house of the plebeian nobility. The Plautii, who probably originated from one of the towns of Latium, had achieved seven consulates in the fifty years following the admission of the plebeians to that magistracy, a censorship with the great Appius Claudius Pulcher (312 BC)—and no consulate ever after.¹¹⁷ In a more recent age, however, Plautii had [21] held the praetorship in years when the influence of the Fulvii was predominant;¹¹⁸ and an alliance of Plautii may safely be inferred with Fulvii—if not, as antiquarian tradition might suggest, with Claudii.¹¹⁹ But this is not all. There is a link between the Plautii and the family of L. Aurelius Orestes (*cos.* 126 BC), probably a marriage between the son and the daughter of successive consuls.¹²⁰ Nothing is known of any political activity of L. Aurelius Orestes; but his father's consulate falls in a period when the Fulvian influence was strongest; and his son, it may be noted, was consul with C. Marius in 103 BC.

This is not much. However, the other consular branch of the Aurelii, the Cottae, were hostile to the Scipiones, especially that Cotta who was consul with Ser. Sulpicius Galba in 144 BC.¹²¹ The colleague of L. Aurelius Orestes in 126 BC was M. Aemilius Lepidus—only a name. It has been conjectured that what

¹¹⁷ On the early history of the Plautii, see Münzer, *RA* 42–3: he argues that they came from Tibur.

¹¹⁸ Namely L. Plautius Hypsaeus, *pr.* 189 BC (Livy 37.47.8) and L. Plautius Hypsaeus, *pr.* 135 BC (Diod. 34–35.2.18).

¹¹⁹ Note, at a much later date, the political connections of M. Plautius Silvanus (*cos.* 2 BC), cf. *RR* 422.

¹²⁰ Cf. Münzer, *RA* 42–3.

¹²¹ See [*RA* 247–8, 320].

his name reveals is really a second consulate of that well-known figure M. Aemilius Lepidus Porcina, *cos.* 137 BC.¹²² That is not very likely. None the less, the presence of an Aemilius Lepidus as consul in the year of Flaccus' election is a fact of some significance, recalling yet again the compacts and arrangements of fifty years before. It is to be regretted that the years following the consulate of Flaccus do not permit similar deductions or speculations.

With the catastrophe of M. Fulvius Flaccus ended a great political family that kept its place on the *Fasti* for two centuries. That was not all. Their party had already been weakened and divided by the disturbances rising out of the tribunate of the elder Gracchus. It now broke up and dissolved. The Claudii changed sides, no Aemilius Lepidus or Junius Brutus reached the consulate for fifty years, and the Sempronii dropped out of the ranks of the nobility.

The chief and acknowledged fame of the Fulvii is military, earned by the conquest of Capua. No persons of note in law and letters emerged from their ranks. But they will be celebrated among the dynastic families. By [22] energy and tenacity, by skilful choice of friends and allies, the Fulvii were able, at certain moments, to dominate the internal politics of Rome, if not to direct the whole government of the Republic.¹²³

¹²² So Münzer, *RA* 142. Noteworthy is the heavy fine inflicted on Porcina by L. Cassius Longinus, censor in 125 BC (Vell. 2.10.1).

¹²³ [*RA* 199–212].

The Politics of the Marcii

[1] None of the plebeian *gentes* can touch the Marcii. Their unique quality does not derive from a claim to descent from the third in the line of the Kings of Rome, or the possession of a family legend as famous as that of Coriolanus.¹ Whatever be thought of Ancus Marcius or of the enigmatic Coriolanus, ostensibly a Roman patrician and declared enemy of the Roman plebs, the honours and dignity at once acquired by the Marcii demonstrate that the patricians recognised this family as their peers and equals.² The first Marcius to become consul was C. Marcius Rutilus (357 BC), a portentous figure. Not only did he hold that office four times—he was the first dictator and first censor from the plebs. His son, consul in 310 BC, was a worthy successor: *pontifex* and augur at the same time, he twice held the censorship, thereby bequeathing a *cognomen* to his descendants. Furthermore, two generations later a Marcius actually became *rex sacrorum*, which office, so it is affirmed in the canonical manuals of religious antiquities, was rigorously confined to the patrician order.³

About the time of the outbreak of the first war with Carthage, when the Tusculan families of the Fulvii and Marcii attest an especial prominence, two senior Marcii are conspicuous, Rutilus holding his second censorship in 265 BC, and Q. Philippus as *magister equitum* to the aged Cn. Fulvius Centumalus in 263 BC. None the less, the Marcii disappear from the consular *Fasti* for a century—there is a gap between Q. Marcius Philippus (281 BC) and his grandson of the same nomenclature (*cos.* 186, *cos.* II 169 BC). With the latter, the Marcii rise again. There follow the consulates of L. Marcius Figulus (162 and 156 BC) and L. Marcius Censorinus (149 BC)—that is to say, in all, five consulates in less than forty years.⁴

[1] ¹ [RA 47, 81].

² Compare especially the arguments of Münzer, RA 70; 81; [123]; RE XIV, [1535–608].

³ Livy (27.6.16) reports the death of M. Marcius, the *rex sacrorum*. For the evidence about the qualification for this priesthood cf. G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Munich 1912²), 491–2, 506. Wissowa does not notice or discuss the anomaly of this plebeian *rex sacrorum*.

⁴ Cf. Münzer, RA 63–4. For the position of the Fulvii at this time, above, [ch. 2, ‘The Predominance of the Fulvii’].

[2] The return of the Marcii is swift and impressive: then they fall back abruptly and remain obscure for a season. Of the three consulars Philippus, Figulus, and Censorinus, neither the sons nor the grandsons reach the supreme magistracy.⁵ The next consul from the Marcii, Q. Marcius Rex (118 BC), belongs to another line, being great-grandson of M. Marcius, the *rex sacrorum*. The resurgence and the subsequent decline of the Marcii are mysterious phenomena: if the full story could be had, it would signally illuminate the history of Roman politics in the second century BC.

When Q. Marcius Philippus stood for the consulate in the year 187 BC, Roman politics were confused and complicated: it is the obscure period between the brief supremacy of the Scipionic party and the predominance of the Fulvio-Claudian group.⁶ The position of the Scipiones had already been seriously impaired, and, in retaliation, this year witnessed attacks upon certain enemies of the Scipiones, namely M. Fulvius Nobilior and Cn. Manlius Vulso (consuls in 189 BC).

Where did Philippus stand in the imbroglio? The consuls of 187 were M. Aemilius Lepidus, who launched a violent assault upon Nobilior, and C. Flaminius, who protected him.⁷ Flaminius presided at the elections; but, apart from his opposition to Lepidus, there is no indication of his political affiliations. Along with Philippus was elected the patrician Sp. Postumius Albinus. The ambitions of the Postumii had been curtailed by the death of L. Postumius, designated for a third consulate in 215 BC; and Postumius had cousins or relations whom he was desirous of pushing forward. One of the cousins became consul in 180 BC, but the careers of the other two were arrested for some years by the Fulvio-Claudian combination until an arrangement was reached in 175 BC, upon which their consulates duly followed.⁸

Of the two consuls of 186 BC, Philippus and Postumius, it was the latter who held the elections, which produced the consular pair Ap. Claudius [3] Pulcher and M. Sempronius Tuditanus—and, among the six praetors, two Postumii.⁹

The politics of the Postumii are not clear at this point; and there is no precise and unequivocal evidence about the attitude and allegiance of Q. Marcius Philippus. Speculation is hazardous. But one thing emerges. Strife was bitter, electioneering unscrupulous; ties of alliance were rapidly contracted, rapidly dissolved. It was, indeed, largely to palliate these evils by regularising

⁵ See [RE XIV.2, 1539, with the proviso in the following sentence]. It is here assumed that C. Marcius Figulus (*cos.* 64 BC) is the great-grandson of C. Figulus (*cos.* 162 BC), not his grandson, as Münzer supposes, RA 153; RE XIV [no. 63, 1559–60]. Cf. below, n. 64.

⁶ See further [cross-reference missing]. ⁷ Livy 38.43.1–[44.6].

⁸ On the politics of these years cf. esp. Münzer, RA 211–12. The other Postumii were the brothers Aulus (*pr.* 185, *cos.* 180 BC), Spurius (*pr.* 183, *cos.* 174 BC), and Lucius (*pr.* 180, *cos.* 173 BC). Also Sp. Albinus Magnus, father of the consul of 148 BC, otherwise unknown, and L. Postumius Tempsanus (*pr.* 185 BC).

⁹ Livy 39.23.2. They were A. Albinus and L. Tempsanus.

(and retarding) the official career of honours, that the *Lex Villia annalis* was passed (180 BC).¹⁰ Yet in this period of ferocious competition, when M. Lepidus was twice thwarted of his consulate by his enemy Nobilior, when L. Aemilius Paullus (*pr.* 191, *cos.* 182 BC) had to wait nine years, Philippus slipped in easily, with only a year's interval after his praetorship:¹¹ a swift promotion, the like of which became impossible after 180 BC.

What is the answer? Powerful allies, consummate guile, or both? To regain the consulate, lost to the Marcii for a century, Philippus had to be discreet and tenacious—the sad plight of Paullus, the brother-in-law of Scipio Africanus, was a warning against a pronounced political allegiance.¹² It may be conjectured that Philippus, warily balanced between contending interests, commended himself to diverse factions—and to an electorate which was still able to show some political sagacity—by adopting the role of a neutral, a safe man. His election was perhaps the outcome of a political compromise: which would not exclude the hypothesis of an arrangement with the Postumii—or the Claudii, the influence of both of which houses is attested at this time, and a little later, when they are actively in the alliance of the Fulvii.

Having duly supported his colleague Postumius and taken a proper share in investigating the affair of the *Bacchanalia*, the consul departed to Liguria where his army suffered a signal defeat, the site being commemorated by his name—the *Saltus Marcius*.¹³ After this, for thirteen years, no activity of Philippus is recorded save a diplomatic mission to the Greek lands in 183 BC [4] which produced a sinister and alarming report of the designs of the King of Macedon.¹⁴ Philippus was again to be employed in these fields.

In 180 BC Philippus was co-opted as *decemvir sacris faciundis* in the place of M. Aemilius Lepidus, who resigned that office to become *pontifex maximus*.¹⁵ It may be that Philippus was assigned some part in the complicated transactions and intrigues of this momentous year when Lepidus, composing a savage feud, passed into the party of the Fulvii, with no little advantage to himself—and credit in the pages of moralising annalists.¹⁶ From 180 BC dates the predominance of the Fulvii and their allies, until they admit to partnership the Postumii in 175 BC, and thereafter the Popillii, a plebeian family which, like the Marcii, had long been out of power.¹⁷ Then follows for the first time in the history of Rome, plebeian pairs of consuls, and with them strong opposition to

¹⁰ Cf. [G. Rotondi, *Leges publicae populi Romani* (Milan 1912) 278–9].

¹¹ He had been praetor in 188 BC: Livy 39.35.2. Of the other five praetors of this year, no fewer than three subsequently became consuls, namely P. Claudius Pulcher (184 BC), M. Claudius Marcellus (183), and L. Manlius Acidinus Fulvianus. This fact is of some interest—for Philippus' conjectural relations with the Fulvio-Claudian group and the Marcelli, see [RA 222–3].

¹² See [Plut. *Aem.* 2.5, 6.8].

¹³ Livy 39.20.5–[10].

¹⁴ Livy 40.3.1.

¹⁵ Livy 40.42.12.

¹⁶ Cf. [Livy 40.45.7–46.16; RA 201–2].

¹⁷ Cf. [RA 216–17 and 'The Predominance of the Fulvii'].

the dominant aristocracy and to the Senate's control of affairs—a deplorable situation happily terminated by the coalition which put Paullus into the consulate and won the third Macedonian War (168 BC).

Philippus' activities in these transactions are certainly important, perhaps insidious and tortuous. In foreign politics at least, the dishonesty of his methods was patent—but profitable to Rome. In the autumn of the year 172 BC, when the Roman government had decided to make war upon Perseus, the King of Macedon, a Roman embassy, headed by Philippus, crossed the Adriatic: its purpose was to win allies in Greece—and postpone the outbreak of hostilities for some six months until the Roman military preparations were complete.¹⁸ Philippus in his *pourparlers* with Perseus could appeal to his relations with the father of the Macedonian King; and he artfully persuaded Perseus to consent to a truce.¹⁹

The returning envoys were jubilant and complacent. But in the Senate, so it is stated, certain old-fashioned persons expressed their disapproval of the new diplomacy—*seniores, quibus nova ac nimis callida minus placebat sapientia*.²⁰ Their identity has not been recorded—perhaps the adherents [5] of the Scipionic party, not least the admirable and virtuous Paullus, were among them. It need not be added that the useful and patriotic conduct of the ambassadors won the approval of the majority of the Senate—that majority which, 'as usual cared more for advantage than for honour'.²¹

The party, or rather the parties, that wanted war prevailed. Their consuls in 171 and 170 BC achieved no kind of success, but only discredit. The next year saw as consuls Philippus and Cn. Servilius Caepio. No less a puzzle than the first consulate of Philippus is his second. Apart from the agile M. Aemilius Lepidus (*cos.* II 175), he was the first senator since Scipio Africanus to attain to such an honour. The electors—or rather the men that pulled the wires and worked the machine—knew that the command in Macedonia would fall to one of the new consuls. They also knew that Philippus' qualifications for the conduct of a foreign war were derisory—a defeat at the hands of those Ligurian mountaineers which in this period commonly provided the cheap raw-material for the exploits and the triumphs of Roman consuls. That was sixteen years before; and the sexagenarian had learned nothing in the meantime. In fact, his command in Macedonia was not very happy, though it gave him ample opportunities to practice that tortuous diplomacy in which he

¹⁸ Livy 42.38.1 etc. On the chronology and purpose of this mission cf. the arguments of F. W. Walbank, 'A Note on the Embassy of Q. Marcius Philippus, 172 BC', *JRS* 31 (1941), 82–93 [= *Selected Papers. Studies in Greek and Roman History and Historiography* (Cambridge 1985) 181–92].

[2] ¹⁹ Livy 42.38.8, cf. above, n. [14].

²⁰ Livy 42.47.9 ['the elder members, to whom this new and exceedingly shrewd wisdom was displeasing'].

²¹ Livy 42.47.9: *vicit tamen ea pars senatus cui potior utilis quam honesti cura erat* ['the part of the Senate that was more preoccupied with what was useful than with what was honourable prevailed'].

excelled. It was Philippus who gave insidious advice to the Rhodians—they should offer to mediate between Rome and Macedonia.²² The Rhodians, taken in by this disinterested consul, subsequently offered their services to the Senate and were brutally rebuffed—some Romans even spoke of making war against them.²³ Furthermore, two other suggestions made by Philippus to the envoys of the Achaeans seem to derive from a desire to foment discord.²⁴

Such was the diplomacy of Philippus, the most unscrupulous of that age.²⁵ His appointment as consul in any case was political. The details—and the personalities most closely concerned—evade inquiry. The choice of his colleague Cn. Servilius Caepio is probably significant.²⁶ Likewise the consul who in 170 BC held the elections that returned that pair, A. Atilius. Like [6] Philippus, he was an old man, having been praetor long ago in 192 BC, and recently, for the second time, in 173 BC.²⁷ Again, the election of Philippus to a second consulate might also be regarded as the last effort of the Fulvian party—or rather of its immediate successors, the Postumii and their allies.²⁸ It may, however, be the bridge and stepping-stone to a new coalition of factions and interests, with a strong Scipionic colouring. Philippus' patrician colleague Caepio stayed in Rome to hold the elections—and the result was the second consulate of L. Aemilius Paullus.²⁹ All that is known of the character and attainments of Philippus would fit him admirably for the role of mediator in politics—to give it no other name.

Attested in the operations of foreign diplomacy, the unobtrusive talents of Philippus won him splendid recompense in domestic politics. Like his first consulate, his second is not explained by conspicuous merit. But Philippus succeeded; and, as the crown of an exemplary life, the venerable consular held the censorship along with his coeval Paullus in 164 BC. Their reputation was diverse: the historian Polybius, the friend and panegyrist of Paullus' son, Scipio Aemilianus, had no reason to celebrate the virtues of Philippus. On the contrary. Polybius had been an eyewitness—and perhaps a victim—of Marcus' diplomacy in the year 169 BC. Yet it will be observed that, on their

²² Polybius 28.17.1–12; Appian, *Mac.* 17. ²³ Livy 45.21.3.

²⁴ Polybius 28.13.7–[9]; 29.25.2, 5. ²⁵ Cf. Münzer, *RE* XIV, 1575.

²⁶ Family tradition or connections may explain the alliance of L. Philippus when consul (91 BC) with Q. Servilius Caepio, praetor in that year, against M. Livius Drusus. Cf. Münzer, *RA* 300.

²⁷ It is perhaps worth noting that A. Atilius, who held the elections for 169 BC, had been with Philippus in the embassy of 172 BC (Livy 42.38.1). The Atilii, like the Marcii, had been through a period of obscurity. After eleven consulates in the years 267–217 BC, their next consul was A. Atilius, in 170. There may have been a link between the two houses. For what it is worth, Silius Italicus (*Punica* 6.403; 576) calls the wife of the famous M. Atilius Regulus a Marcia. Close personal or political allies of Philippus are difficult to find. Perhaps the Claudii Marcelli? Observe a Marcellus, praetor with Philippus in 188 BC (Livy 38.35.2), another in 185 (Livy 39.23.2), and M. Claudius serving under Philippus in Macedonia (Livy 44.3.2): the last of these is a different person from M. Claudius Marcellus, *pr.* 169, *cos.* 166 BC.

²⁸ See [*RA* 222–3]. ²⁹ See [*Livy* 44.17.1–4; *RA* 152–3].

military record, neither Philippus nor Paullus should have been likely to turn out a victorious general in the war against Macedon. Their second consulates were due to devious political combinations.³⁰

The success of Q. Marcius Philippus promoted the fortune of other Marcii. His kinsman, C. Marcius Figulus, praetor in 169 BC, commanded the Roman fleet in that year.³¹ He was chosen consul for 162 BC along with P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, an election declared null and void by Ti. Sempronius Gracchus (the brother-in-law of Nasica) because of religious scruples which subsequently occurred to him.³² Nasica had to wait until 155 BC for a proper (and second) consulate, but Figulus achieved it a year sooner, with L. Cornelius [7] Lentulus Lupus for colleague.³³ This was something, to have outdistanced the son-in-law of Africanus.

Friendly relations between the Marcii and the Scipionic group, arising from the coalition of 169 BC and advertised by the censorship of Philippus and Paullus, might perhaps be inferred; and the next Marcius to attain to the consulate, L. Marcius Censorinus, had for colleague M. Manilius, a partisan of the Scipiones (149 BC).³⁴ But all is uncertain: the composition of consular pairs is determined not only by alliances but as a compromise between rival factions. Moreover, Censorinus held the censorship two years later with L. Lentulus Lupus, which is not exactly an indication of Scipionic affiliations.

The period following appears to reveal the Marcii in a different camp to the Scipionic party. In the year 144 BC the praetor Q. Marcius Rex, constructing an aqueduct, wished to bring to the Capitol the conduit, to which he bequeathed his family name, the *Aqua Marcia*. The work was completed in 140 BC,³⁵ not without having encountered fierce opposition in the Senate. The Sibylline Books were invoked against Marcius—they indicated, it was alleged, that the *Anio novus*, not the *Aqua Marcia*, should be brought to the Capitol. Objection was raised in 143 BC, and in 140 BC. On each occasion, the influence of Rex prevailed. It will be pertinent to enquire who were the friends—and who were the enemies—of Rex. Unfortunately, no certainty can be had. The interpretation of the passage of Frontinus recording this affair is vexed and disputed.³⁶

³⁰ On Paullus, cf. [no. 1, 'The Divorce of Aemilius Paullus'].

³¹ Livy 43.15.3 etc. Münzer, *RA* 153, supposes Figulus to be a first cousin of Philippus, their common grandfather being the consul of 281 BC: it is a long interval.

³² [Cic. *ND* 2.10–12].

³³ Lentulus Lupus, however (later censor in 147 BC and *princeps senatus* in 130 BC), though a Cornelius, does not seem to have been a political ally of the Scipiones. The attacks of Lucilius on him are significant.

[3] ³⁴ [Evidence in *MRR* 1.458]. ³⁵ Livy *Ep.* Ox. I. 188–9.

³⁶ Frontin. *Aq.* 1.7: *eo tempore decemviri aliis ex causis libros Sibyllinos inspiciunt, invenisse dicuntur non esse aquam Marciam sed potius Anionem—de hoc enim constantius traditur—in Capitolium perducendum, deque ea re in senatu M. Lepido pro collega verba faciente actum Appio Claudio Q. Caecilio consulibus eandemque post annum tertium C. Laelio Q. Servilio consulibus retractatam, sed utroque tempore vicisse gratiam Marcii atque ita in Capitolium esse aquam*

On one account the Lepidus who made a speech in the Senate in 143 BC is deemed to have defended Rex—and to have been M. Aemilius Lepidus Porcina (*cos.* 137 BC).³⁷ Porcina, it will be noted, was hostile to the Scipiones—as were the consuls of the year, Ap. Claudius Pulcher and Q. Metellus Macedonicus.³⁸

Despite his influence, Rex did not become consul; and the son of Figulus failed in his candidature, for reasons unknown.³⁹ Of the son of Philippus nothing is recorded save that he served as a military tribune under his father [8] in Macedonia.⁴⁰ But the grandson of Philippus contracted a marriage of considerable political significance: at some date not later than 136 BC Q. Philippus took to wife a daughter of Ap. Claudius Pulcher.⁴¹ This matrimonial alliance belongs, along with others, to the great anti-Scipionic coalition that grew up around the Fulvio-Claudian party.⁴² The censorship of Ap. Pulcher and Q. Fulvius Nobilior in 136 BC showed their strength.

Of the attitude of the Marcii at the time of the Gracchan disturbances evidence is lacking precisely when evidence would be convincing. A simple fact is relevant—Cn. Marcius Censorinus, tribune of the plebs in 123 BC or in 122 BC, proposed a measure concerning *tribuni militum*. C. Gracchus made a speech in support.⁴³ Certain indications may be held to encourage the hypothesis that some at least of the Marcii had been on the ‘wrong side’. In the period of reaction that followed the catastrophe of M. Fulvius Flaccus and

perductam [‘At that time the Decemvirs, consulting the Sibylline Books for other reasons, are said to have discovered that the Marcian water, or rather the Anio (for tradition more regularly mentions this) was not to be brought to the Capitol. The matter is said to have been debated in the Senate, in the consulship of Appius Claudius and Quintus Caecilius, and Marcus Lepidus acted as spokesman for his colleague; and three years later the matter is said to have been brought up again by Lucius Lentulus, in the consulship of Gaius Laelius and Quintus Servilius. However, on both occasions the influence of Marcius Rex prevailed, and thus the water was brought to the Capitol’]. In the crucial passage *M. Lepido pro collega* some accept Pighius’ emendation *pro collegio* and suppose Lepidus to have been a member and spokesman of the *decemviri sacris faciundis*. (For the form of phrase, cf. Cic. *Dom.* 136: *M. Aemilium pontificem maximum pro collegio respondisse*.) Münzer, however, keeping the text, assumes that Lepidus spoke in defence of Rex (*RA* 238–9). Against this interpretation, which is attractive in that it supports certain political reconstructions, a linguistic point must be urged. The intervention of Lepidus in 143 BC and of Lentulus in 140 BC was surely against the interests of Marcius, for Frontinus goes on to say *sed utroque tempore vicisse gratiam Marcii*. [*MRR* I, 473, n. 1; III, 9—the *cos.* 158].

³⁷ Münzer, *RA* 238–9; *RE* XIV, 1582. Cf. the previous note.

³⁸ See [*RA* 237–8].

³⁹ Val. Max. 9.3.2: *consulatus repulsae dolore accensus eo quidem magis quod illum his patri suo datum meminerat* [‘he was bitterly hurt by his defeat in the consular elections, all the more because he recalled that his father had been given the office twice’].

[4] ⁴⁰ Livy 44.3.2.

⁴¹ The relationship emerges from Cic. *Dom.* 84. The lower limit for the dating of this marriage is provided by the age of L. Philippus, candidate for the consulate in 94 BC. See n. [26].

⁴² See [*RA* 208–10].

⁴³ *GL* 1.208.20. If the coinage of M. Marcius M.’ f. (*BMCR* 1.149–50 [nos. 1008–18]) could be dated it might be of some relevance to the history of the Gracchan period. [Cf. Sydenham, *RRC* p. 61, no. 500–1: c. 119–110 BC = Crawford, *RRC* 1.277, no. 245: 134 BC.]

C. Gracchus, and consequent eclipse of the Fulvio-Claudian party, the Marcii were visited with a series of calamities.

Q. Marcius Rex secured the consulate (118 BC), but soon afterwards was prosecuted, perhaps because of his campaign against a petty tribe of the Alps, the Stoeni, which earned laurels undeserved.⁴⁴ He was defended by the orator Antonius, a master of forensic pathos, who no doubt exploited to the full the untimely death of Marcius' only son during his father's consulate.⁴⁵ Rex was preserved by the artifices of Antonius. But Philippus, the son-in-law of the great Ap. Pulcher, succumbed to a prosecution and went to live in exile at Nuceria.⁴⁶

That did not exhaust the tribulations of the Marcii. Their women-folk were made to suffer. In 114 BC certain Vestal Virgins were condemned.⁴⁷ The charge was misconduct, the reason political. The principal culprit was an Aemilia, the second a Licinia—members of noble families that stood behind the Gracchi. The third was a Marcia.

The allegiance of the Marcii now becomes clearer. Additional facts [9] will confirm it. Julius Caesar, in public advertisement of a pedigree that went back to Kings and Gods, proclaimed that on the maternal side his line descended from the Marcii Reges.⁴⁸ The easiest explanation is that his grandfather, otherwise unknown, married a sister of Q. Rex (*pr.* 144 BC). Hence Q. Rex (*cos.* 118 BC) had for cousins Sex. Julius Caesar (*cos.* 91 BC), Julia, who married Marius, and C. Caesar, father of the Dictator.⁴⁹ The marriage of Marius and Julia can hardly be later than 110 BC;⁵⁰ and a little later C. Caesar took to wife Aurelia, presumably the daughter of L. Aurelius Cotta (*cos.* 119 BC).⁵¹ This alliance is of some relevance to the Marcii. Cotta being the predecessor of Rex in the consulate may have influenced his election. In any case, there is a chronological nexus in the career of their parents—in 144 BC L. Aurelius Cotta was consul, Q. Marcius Rex praetor. This Cotta was a declared enemy of the Scipiones.⁵²

So far indications have been adduced that certain ties connect the Marcii with the Fulvio-Claudian combination, with opponents of the Scipiones and with the party of Marius. The next of the Marcii is L. Philippus (*cos.* 91 BC). To elucidate his political allegiances is not an easy task—he changed them so frequently. The attention of history is captured by his firm stand when consul

[4] ⁴⁴ *CIL* 1², p. 341.

⁴⁵ Val. Max. 5.10.3; Cic. *De or.* 2.124.

⁴⁶ Cic. *Balb.* 28.

⁴⁷ For the details and the interpretation, cf. Münzer, *RA* 243–4. Münzer supposes that these women were near relatives of M. Aemilius Porcina (*pr.* ? 143 BC), C. Licinius Crassus (*tr. pl.* 145 BC) and Q. Rex (*pr.* 144 BC), possibly daughters. On the politics of this Crassus cf. Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 96: he vainly attempted to transfer the recruiting of the priestly colleges to the control of the People.

⁴⁸ Suet. *DJ* 6.1.

⁴⁹ See the table [by Münzer in *RE* XIV, 2, 1541].

⁵⁰ At least, to judge by the age of the younger Marius (*cos.* 82 BC), on which see *RE* XIV, 1812.

⁵¹ [Suet. *DJ* 74; Plut. *Caes.* 9.3; see *RA* 313, 327.]

⁵² [*RE* II, 2, 2484–5, no. 98.]

in defence of the vested interests that were threatened by the proposals of the aristocratic demagogue M. Livius Drusus. His earlier career should not be forgotten. The son of a disgraced father did not find things easy. At the outset he failed to secure election as a *tribunus militum*.⁵³ Later, tribune of the plebs at a time when tribunes were bold and inventive in devising measures to damage or embarrass the governing oligarchy (104 BC), Philippus toyed with an agrarian bill and then dropped it⁵⁴—perhaps in order to solicit favour without incurring danger. Further he was held up in his advance to consulship: a candidate for 93 BC, the noble saw himself outstripped by a *novus homo* of no merit or consequence, a certain M. Herennius.⁵⁵ The next year Philippus probably desisted—and was rewarded by the support [10] of the successful consuls C. Claudius Pulcher and M. Perperna, being elected for 91 BC. Pulcher was his own uncle, whereas Perperna's family owed his ennoblement to the Claudii.⁵⁶ Pulcher, so it is attested, carried great weight in politics.⁵⁷

Numerous are the consulars and other senators that held military commands for Rome in the war against the Italians. Philippus is not among them.⁵⁸ Nor is his name mentioned in the civil strife and tumults of 88 and 87 BC. He emerges unscathed to hold the censorship in 86 BC, under the rule of the faction of Marius, with M. Perperna as his colleague—a significant pair.

Another Marcius, however, C. Censorinus, was a bold man. In 91 BC he proposed to prosecute for corruption Sulla, the ex-governor of Cilicia, but dropped the case.⁵⁹ This enmity, if no other reason, determined his allegiance. Censorinus was probably among the twelve senators who, along with Marius, were declared public enemies by Sulla in 88 BC.

Censorinus fought for the party of Marius and fell in battle at the Colline Gate in 82 BC, one of the principal generals of the motley and largely Samnite army that marched on Rome in a last and desperate venture.⁶⁰ Philippus in the meantime had passed quietly over to the other side and for the remaining years of his life occupied the happy and decorative role of elder statesman in the restored oligarchy, with not an enemy left in the world—they were all dead—and few friends.⁶¹

The fortunes of the Marcii seemed set upon a firm basis, with no temptation to repeat those errors of judgement that had forfeited honours and engendered catastrophes. Like the patrician Claudii, they now seem to follow a highly

⁵³ Cic. *Planc.* 51. ⁵⁴ Cic. [*Off.* 2.73]. ⁵⁵ Cic. *Brut.* 166.

⁵⁶ On the Perpernae see Münzer, *RA* 95–7; *RE* XIX, 892–901.

⁵⁷ Cic. *Brut.* 166: *propter summam nobilitatem et singularem potentiam magnus erat.*

⁵⁸ Observe, with Cn. Strabo at Asculum, Q. Marcius Q. f. Pap. [*CIL* 1².709], on whom see below [n. 72].

⁵⁹ Sall. [*ap. Firm. Mat. Math.* 1.7.28]; Plut. *Sull.* 5.

⁶⁰ Appian, *BC* 1.93 etc. Note also L. Censorinus, *triumvir monetalis* c. 83 BC, *BMCRR* 1.338[–39, nos. 2657–63 = Sydenham, *RRC* p. 117–18, no. 737 = Crawford, *RRC* 1.377–8, no. 363].

⁶¹ Cf. *RR* 19.

conservative policy; and the link with the Claudii is reinforced in this age. Q. Marcius Rex married one of the daughters of Ap. Claudius Pulcher (*cos.* 79 BC) and thereby entered into the orbit of the Metelli.⁶² Consulates now came quickly to the Marcii, to Rex in 68 BC, to Figulus in 64 BC, and to Philippus, son of the grand old man, in 56 BC. The line of Censorinus, however, [11] compromised by association with the party of Marius—or frustrated by accident—has to wait for a generation.⁶³ Rex and Figulus died before long, with no great achievement to their credit, and no consular sons.⁶⁴ L. Marcius Philippus (*cos.* 56 BC) carries on the tradition.

Craft and duplicity seem innate in the Marcii Philippi. That Philippus who wriggled into two consulates, deceived the King of Macedonia, and wound up his unedifying career as censor, set a shining example to his descendants. They were equal to the challenge. The Philippus who rode the stormy season of Marius and Sulla was not unworthy of that ancestor: his son, consul in 56 BC also ran true to form. Having given his daughter to Cato for wife,⁶⁵ he secured protection and advancement to the consulate by a skilful second marriage—he chose Atia, widow of C. Octavius, niece of Caesar and relative of Pompeius. Of the children of Atia, the daughter was married to C. Claudius Marcellus (*cos.* 50 BC); the son C. Octavius, being the grand-nephew of Caesar, was destined in any event for high renown.⁶⁶

The marriage alliances of the Marcii are not only cunning but peculiar—the son of Philippus also married an Atia, sister of his father's second wife.⁶⁷ As for Marcia, married to Cato, she was made the subject of a strange but not unprofitable experiment. Cato surrendered her to his kinsman Hortensius; then, after the death of Hortensius, he took Marcia back again and with her the estate of the opulent deceased.⁶⁸ In ancient times and in modern the whole affair has been a matter of debate because of its relevance to the character of Cato—and, in general, to the habits of the Roman aristocracy. It is worth

[5] ⁶² Cf. *RR* 20 n. 5.

⁶³ L. Censorinus, *tr. mon.* 83 BC (*BMCR* 1.338–9, nos. 2657–63 = Sydenham, *RRC* p. 117–18, no. 737 [= Crawford, *RRC* 1.377–8, no. 363]), presumably is the Censorinus who turns up as an admiral of Lucullus in 70 BC (Memnon 53 = *FrGH* III.B 364–5); his son is the consul of 39 BC. The Censorinus who accompanied Q. Cicero to Asia (*Ad Q. fratrem* 1.2.13) and perished with his friend, the young Publius Crassus, in 53 BC (Plut. *Crass.* 25) is probably a son of the notorious Marian partisan; cf. *RE* XIV, 1550.

⁶⁴ For the son of Rex cf. the inscription at Eleusis (*ILS* 4041) set up by him and by his cousin, the son of Ap. Pulcher (*cos.* 54 BC). He may have made his peace with the Dictator (cf. *Fam.* 13.52). Then he disappears. About Figulus (*cos.* 64 BC), next to nothing is known. His partner in the consulate was L. Julius Caesar—who did not, however, belong to that branch of the family that was connected with the Marcii Reges (see *RA* 326, 347). Münzer supposes that Figulus was the grandson of C. Figulus (*cos.* 162, *cos.* II 156 BC). But if, as he assumes, that Figulus, already well on in years when he became praetor in 169 BC, was the grandson of the consul of 281 BC (*RA* 153; *RE* XIV, 1559) it is surely preferable to add another generation to the pedigree.

⁶⁵ Plut. *Cato min.* 25.

⁶⁶ *RR* 212.

⁶⁷ *RE* II, 2258.

⁶⁸ App. *BC* 2.99; Plut. *Cato min.* 25, 39; etc.

adding that no woman was better suited to such a transaction than a daughter of the supple and diplomatic Marcii. Lucan's epic on the fall of *Libertas* shows her in an ideal presentation.⁶⁹

Silent in dangerous debates on high policy, Philippus also shunned the rival camps in the war of Caesar and Pompeius. Nor was he conspicuous during the Dictatorship of Caesar. The events following the Ides of March put [12] his qualities to the test—he was the stepfather of the Dictator's heir, C. Julius Caesar Octavianus. On arriving in Italy, the young man sought his earliest counsel from Philippus, and was much in his company. No record stands of the advice he received: it was presumably of the best.⁷⁰ But when Caesar's heir marched on Rome, Philippus refused to be publicly compromised in actions of violence and illegality. True to the traditions and to the advantages of his house, he played a double game, hoping that the influence of Antonius would secure the consulate for his son.⁷¹ That consulate was in fact achieved, but after some delay and with the support of Octavianus (38 BC); and another Marcius, consul suffect in 36 BC may have been his cousin.⁷² A skilful matrimonial policy was pursued—the daughter of L. Philippus (*cos.* 38 BC) was given in marriage to the patrician Paullus Fabius Maximus, a person high in favour with Augustus.⁷³

The Philippi, it should seem, from their consistent record of smooth or tortuous politics, were destined to survive and prosper under a regime that rewarded guileful subservience and proscribed the brave splendour of the Roman aristocrat—*ob virtutes certissimum exitium* ['the surest ruin caused by virtues']. It was not so.

This was the last consulate of the Marcii Philippi. The line of Censorinus endured the longest. An impoverished partisan of Caesar, L. Marcius Censorinus (*pr.* 43 BC) did good service to Antonius as proconsul of Macedonia and won the consulate (39 BC).⁷⁴ His son C. Marcius Censorinus (*cos.* 8 BC) was a successful politician, favoured by Augustus; he was connected with the family of the great Statilius Taurus;⁷⁵ and he held positions of some consequence in

⁶⁹ Luc. *Phars.* 2.327–49.

⁷⁰ RR 114, 128, 322.

⁷¹ RR 134.

[6] ⁷² The new *Fasti* of the *Vicomagistri* reveal this consul (AE 1937, 62 [= AE 2002, 206]). Perhaps Q. Philippus, proconsul of Cilicia in the period 47–45 BC, Cic. *Fam.* 13.73–4: compare the arguments adduced in 'Observations on the Province of Cilicia', in *Anatolian Studies presented to William Hepburn Buckler* (Manchester 1939), 299–332, at 306–[24] [= RP, I, 120–49, at 126–40]. If so, not the Q. Marcius Q. f. Pap. present in the *consilium* of Cn. Pompeius Strabo at Asculum, as suggested by Cichorius (*Römische Studien*, Leipzig and Berlin 1922, 168–9), but rather his son. Yet the Marcius consul suffect in 36 BC might be the excellent Q. Marcius Crispus, the Caesarian marshal whose troops went over to the Liberators in 43 BC (RR 199).

⁷³ RE XIV, 1605–6; RR 421.

⁷⁴ Plut. *Ant.* 24; CIL 1², p. 50. Cicero (*Phil.* 11.36) had stigmatised him as *in bello hostem, in pace sectorem*.

⁷⁵ Vell. 2.14.3.

the eastern lands in the years when Tiberius was in eclipse.⁷⁶ But he died there in AD 2, leaving no male issue, but commemoration in an ode of Horace.⁷⁷

It is not the purpose of these pages to furnish a complete history of the *gens Marcia* or full details about all its members. The subject of central interest is the resurgence of the Marcii in the second century BC [13] and their collapse in and after the Gracchan period. Evidence indirect but converging suggests that certain of the Marcii were on the side of the Gracchi, that they invoked the people against the Senate. At first sight confirmation might appear to come from an unexpected quarter, Virgil describes Ancus Marcius the King of Rome as:

*iactantior Ancus
nunc quoque iam nimium gaudens popularibus auris.*⁷⁸

[too-boastful Ancus, even now excessively pleased by the people's fleeting praise]

Does this mean that good King Ancus, *bonus Ancus* as another poet called him [Enn. *Ann.* 137; cf. Lucr. 3.1025], was really a *popularis*, a demagogue? No: there is no support anywhere in the tradition for his conception of Ancus Marcius. A dreary Greek antiquarian, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, shows that the demagogic attributes belong to Servius Tullus, the sixth of the Kings of Rome.⁷⁹ The poet has mixed his legends and sinned against the text-books.

⁷⁶ [CIG 2698b; Vell. 2.102.1.]

⁷⁷ *Carm.* 4.8.

⁷⁸ *Aen.* 6.815–16.

⁷⁹ *Ant. Rom.* 4.8.3: ὁ Τύλλιος ἐπὶ τὸ δημαγωγεῖν καὶ θεραπεύειν τοὺς ἀπόρους τῶν πολιτῶν ἐτρεπέτο [‘Tullius applied himself to flattering and courting the poorer citizens’].

The Abdication of Sulla

[1] When L. Cornelius Sulla, having solemnly abjured the name and the attributes of supreme power, departed from the Forum and went back to his mansion, no longer dictator and omnipotent but merely a private citizen, he was set upon by a small boy who stuck at his heels all the way, with taunts and vulgar abuse. Sulla made the appropriate comment. ‘Because of this urchin’, he said, ‘nobody will ever abdicate again.’ And, so the writer affirms who tells the story, Sulla was right: the behaviour of Julius Caesar bore out his prognostication.¹ Caesar’s words can testify as well as Caesar’s actions—the *res publica* was only a name, it lacked shape or substance; Sulla, by resigning the dictatorship, demonstrated his political illiteracy.² What more does anybody want? The utterance is authenticated, for T. Ampius Balbus set it on record. Though Ampius, be it noted in passing, was an enemy of Caesar, a fanatical adherent of the Pompeian cause.³

[2] For the rest, this important transaction seems to have conveyed only a faint appeal to authors who revel in the picturesque, the dramatic, and the edifying. They prefer to dwell upon the death and the obsequies of Sulla—the golden couch and the regal pomp, the veterans rallying to their *imperator* for the ultimate procession. The luck of Sulla Felix held to the end—it was a rainy day, but the sky cleared and the elements favoured his incineration.

Appointed dictator at the end of 82 BC, Sulla resigned, so it appears, at the very beginning of 79 BC.⁴ He died after an interval of not much more than a year, in the spring of 78 BC.

[1] ¹ App. BC 1.103.

² Suet. DJ 77.1: *nec minoris impotentiae voces propalam edebat, ut Titus Ampius scribit: nihil esse rem publicam, appellationem modo sine corpore ac specie. Sullam nescisse litteras qui dictaturam deposuerit. debere homines consideratius iam loqui secum ac pro legibus habere quae dicat* [‘What he said in public contexts, as recorded by Titus Ampius, was no less arrogant: he said that the republic is nothing, just a name, without body or form; that Sulla did not know his ABC when he gave up the dictatorship; that men should have more consideration in speaking to him and regard what he said as law’].

³ On Ampius, cf. Cic. *Fam.* 6.12.3.

⁴ For the date, see [below, p. 61].

Plutarch disposes of the abdication in a single sentence.⁵ In the *Epitome* of Livy it is not mentioned at all. The summary of Book 89 is longer than most. Opening at the end of 82 BC, it records the fate of several leaders of the vanquished cause, Sulla's dictatorship and the operations of Cn. Pompeius in Sicily and Africa, winding up with the reduction of certain cities still recalcitrant, Nola and Volaterrae in Italy, Mytilene abroad (80 BC). Then, leaping over the year 79 BC, the next book begins with the death of Sulla, the public funeral and the armed rising of M. Aemilius Lepidus.⁶ [3] It is insecure to argue from an *Epitome*, the compiler of which shows singular caprice in the choice of material. Yet Livy himself may have accorded little space or significance to the events of 79 BC. In dividing his history into periods he could not escape the influence of his predecessors, however much he might disapprove of their style or sentiments. Sallust led off with 78 BC, the year of Lepidus and Catulus. One of the earliest events in his *Historiae* was the death and funeral of Sulla, which precipitated the *stasis* of the two consuls and the first attempt to overthrow the restored oligarchy.

The ancient evidence for Sulla's dictatorship and for the interval between his abdication and his death is highly unsatisfactory. The fullest source, Appian, lacks order and precision. Plutarch omits the legislation altogether. There is prompt defence—Plutarch was a biographer, not a historian. But a biographer, if laws and the constitution were repellent, should have discovered in the act of abdication a theme for edifying discourse. It was dramatic by its very simplicity; and it might yield the clue to Sulla's character and ambitions. Even Appian is inspired to lengthy speculations.

[4] The chronology demands careful investigation. Proper attention to the identity of the consuls of 81–78 BC, necessary for this purpose, will also help to elucidate much that is obscure in the history of these years.

The Battle of the Colline Gate was fought on 1 November 82 BC. Upon the massacre of Samnite prisoners followed without delay the slaughter of Roman citizens. The proscriptions began before they were sanctioned. There were no consuls. The *interrex* L. Valerius Flaccus, exceeding the normal function of his office, proposed a law whereby Sulla should be elected dictator for the purpose of regulating the commonwealth, *legibus scribundis et rei publicae constituendae* ['for the drafting of laws and the regulation of the republic'].⁷ The *nobiles* had recaptured their *res publica* from its enemies, from the Marian

⁵ Plut. *Sull.* 34.

⁶ Livy *Per.* 90: *Sylla decessit, honosque ei a senatu habitus est ut in campo Martio sepeliretur. M. Lepidus, cum acta Syllae temptaret rescindere, bellum excitavit* ['Sulla died, and the Senate granted him the honour of being buried in the Campus Martius. Marcus Lepidus, as he attempted to rescind the acts of Sulla, caused a war'].

⁷ App. *BC* 1.99: *δικτάτορα ἐπὶ θέσει νόμων, ὃν αὐτὸς ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμάσειε, καὶ καταστήσει τῆς πολιτείας* ['dictator for the enactment of laws, as he himself might deem fit, and for the regulation of the commonwealth'].

faction, the knights and the Italians: to render it safe and habitable was the task of the leader whom fate and war had thrown up.

From senior statesmen the dictator could expect little, for help or for hindrance. Few of the consulars had survived the murderous decade, and they not the boldest. Only three deserve any mention. The patrician L. Flaccus, the *princeps senatus*, had been the *colleague* of Marius [4a] in 100 BC, decorative perhaps but of no weight or substance then or later, least of all when the dictator nominated him as his deputy, *magister equitum*. Of M. Perperna (*cos.* 92 BC) history was to record no talent save that of longevity.⁸ Only Philippus counts (*cos.* 91 BC), an able and crafty man. But this illustrious timeserver does not emerge again to political activity until after the death of Sulla.

For purposes of form and ceremony the republic though still dormant required a pair of consuls for the next year. Nobles were eager and ready, whose careers had been curtailed by the wars, allies of the proconsul or high born renegades; [5] and partisans without ancestry could exhibit signal services. The dictator did not allow himself to be cajoled or impressed. Q. Lucretius Ofella, vaunting his capture of Praeneste, paid insufficient heed to Sulla's admonishment: he was cut down in the Forum. Sulla gave the order, and Sulla took the responsibility. The actual choice of consuls was no less revealing. Sulla passed over the most eminent aristocrats. It was deliberate. Instead, he installed Cn. Cornelius Dolabella, with M. Tullius Decula for colleague. Dolabella belonged to one of the less distinguished branches of the patrician Corneli—two consuls only in the last two centuries: he happens to be mentioned once in the story of the wars, at the last battle, at Sulla's side, but not as an army commander.⁹ Dolabella at least had a pedigree. Tullius had nothing. In an age not altogether void of curious information about the family, friends, and attainments of senators, M. Tullius Decula comes out of darkness to the bright pinnacle of civic honour—and quickly returns to his own place. Some ten or fifteen years earlier he had failed to secure election as [6] aedile.¹⁰ That is all. It would be idle to guess at some tie of kinship with Sulla, some cause of private gratitude, *amicitia* or *fides* rewarded. If there was nepotism, it was open and flagrant: Tullius was a political nonentity.

⁸ Perperna died in 49 BC, at the age of ninety-eight: Plin. *Nat.* 7.156.

⁹ Plut. *Sull.* 29. Note, however the mysterious reference to a naval command of Dolabella, *Comp. Lysandri et Sullae* 2.4, cf. below, [n. 94, and n. 27 of no. 5, 'The Speech for Roscius of Ameria']. The last consul of the Corneli Dolabellae was in 159 BC—nothing is known about him. That the family was not of the most eminent may perhaps be deduced from Cicero's firm remarks about the arrogance of the other Cn. Dolabella, the praetor of 81 BC: *Dolabella, quemadmodum solent homines nobiles, seu recte seu perperam facere coeperunt, ita in utroque excellunt, ut nemo nostro loco natus adsequi possit, iniuriam facere fortissime perseverat* (Quinct. 31 ['Dolabella, according to the habit of the *nobiles*, who, whether they have begun to act rightly or wrongly, carry either conduct to such a height that no one born in our rank of life can overtake them, therefore perseveres most bravely in committing injustice']).

[3] ¹⁰ Cic. *Planc.* 51.

The dictator set about his work in tranquillity. 1 June 81 BC, was fixed as the term of the proscriptions.¹¹ The next month may have exhibited a good augury for the abatement of despotic rule. Sulla's reorganisation of the commonwealth, sharp and severe in Sulla's fashion, did not proceed from abstruse speculation or lag through long debate. One of his measures was to advance the consular elections from autumn to the month of July. The change may have taken effect at once. It was of minor consequence. Not so the next consuls—Sulla himself (as *cos. II*), with Q. Metellus Pius.

The Caecilii Metelli—six consulates in the space of fifteen years—had been the dominant aristocratic house of the previous generation.¹² After a partial eclipse due to the rise of Marius [7] and other reasons, they were waiting to retrieve their primacy, if they could light upon the right agent or leader. In 89 BC, shortly after election to his first consulate, Sulla took to wife a Metella, provoking loud indignation, so it is alleged, among high and low: he was not good enough for her.¹³ The Metelli made a sagacious choice—the match was probably decided before the election. Sulla's bride was the widow of their ally M. Aemilius Scaurus, who though a patrician, had to struggle for his career no less than any *novus homo*. Sulla is comparable—his line had two centuries of obscurity behind it. Scaurus served the Metelli well in the years of peace: they now counted on the military ability of Sulla.

Sulla kept faith. He neglected no means of reinforcing the alliance. Scarcely was the final victory won than, in order to attach a young military leader, Cn. Pompeius, to the cause of the *nobiles*, he instructed him to divorce his wife and marry Aemilia (Sulla's stepdaughter), torn though pregnant from her husband.¹⁴ Pompeius complied. Not long afterwards Aemilia died in childbirth. The place was filled by Mucia, whose mother belonged to the family of the Metelli.¹⁵ Such were dynastic politics. It may be observed as relevant that Sulla's attempt to [7a] dissolve the marriage of Julius Caesar was not so much an insult as a compliment—he wished to reclaim this young patrician from the Marian faction.¹⁶ Native spirit stood firm, not without encouragement from influential nobles.¹⁷ Caesar kept his bride, the daughter of Cinna.

¹¹ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 128.

¹² Namely, 123–109 BC. Cf. the remarks of Vell. 2.11.3 and the stemma of the Metelli, *RE* III, 1229–30; J. Carcopino, *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée* (Paris 1931), table at the end; R. Syme, *RR*, Table I.

¹³ Plut. *Sull.* 6. ¹⁴ Plut. *Sull.* 33; *Pomp.* 9.

¹⁵ She was the daughter of Q. Mucius Scaevola (*cos.* 95 BC), half-sister of Q. Metellus Celer (*cos.* 60 BC) and of Nepos (*cos.* 57 BC).

¹⁶ Suet. *DJ* 1.1. For this interpretation, cf. H. Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt in die Geschichte* (Munich 1938) 80.

¹⁷ Suet. *DJ* 1.2: *donec per virgines Vestales perque Mamercum Aemilium et Aurelium Cottam propinquos et adfines suos veniam impetravit* ['until he secured forgiveness through the intervention of the Vestal Virgins, and his relatives Mamercus Aemilius and Aurelius Cotta'].

The omnipotent dictator had the consolation of separating Cinna's widow from M. Pupius Piso.¹⁸

[8] The head of all the Metelli was the most eminent man in the Roman aristocracy. Virtue too had singled him out. The *cognomen* of Metellus Pius attested untiring efforts on behalf of an exiled parent. As he had been praetor in 89 BC, his consulate was long overdue.¹⁹ Sulla made handsome amends and secured for his wife's cousin the office of *pontifex maximus* as well. Nor was posthumous confirmation lacking. In his *Memoirs* the favourite of fortune numbered not least among his many felicities the loyal concord of the alliance with Metellus Pius.²⁰

To return to the order of events. Sulla and Pius were to hold the consulate in 80 BC. If the normal provisions about magistracies were now in force, it would have been proper, as the *lex Sempronia* enjoined, to allocate the consular provinces before the elections. Metellus subsequently departed to Spain, perhaps before the end of 80 BC. But it is by no means clear that his *provincia* had been fixed as early as the summer of 81 BC. As for his colleague, an epitomator who is brief but not unreliable states [9] that Sulla had been allotted the province of Gallia Cisalpina.²¹ The time, manner, and purpose of the assignation are in dispute. The simplest explanation need not be the worst—a provincial governorship for a consul, not a special (and peculiar) grant to the *dictator rei publicae constituendae*. If the Senate made the allocation of Cisalpine Gaul, whether in virtue of the *lex Sempronia*, or subsequently, when Sulla was either consul designate or actual consul, conclusions follow, of no small consequence. Sulla might go to his province in 79 BC—or even earlier, before the year of his consulate had elapsed. Would he then still be holding the dictatorship? Sulla was meditating a quiet, legitimate, and safe way out—or at least he let them think so.

[9a] The year of Sulla and Metellus provides certain indications of a return to ordered government. That he chose to hold the supreme magistracy was significant—at least to outward show.²² A fragment of Sallust's *Historiae* reveals a peculiar incident—Sulla proposing a law for the recall of Pompeius from Africa, and submitting through collusion, to a tribune's veto.²³ More

[4] ¹⁸ Vell. 2.41.2.

¹⁹ His praetorship is attested by Cic. *Arch.* 7. There was some chance that he might have stood for the consulate in 87 BC, cf. the observations of M. Gelzer, 'Cn. Pompeius Strabo und der Aufstieg seines Sohnes Magnus', *Abhandlungen der Preussischer Akademie. Philologisch-historische Klasse* 14 (1941) 19 [= *Vom römischen Staat* II (Leipzig 1944) 56–98 at 80 = *Kleine Schriften* II (Wiesbaden 1963) 106–38 at 124].

²⁰ Plut. *Sull.* 6.5: ὅς γε καὶ τῆς πρὸς Μέτελλον ὁμονοίας, ἰσότημιον ἄνδρα καὶ κηδεστήν, εὐτυχίαν τινὰ θεῖαν αἰτιᾶται ['he explains even his concord with Metellus, a man equal in rank and a relative by marriage, as an instance of divine good fortune'].

²¹ Granius Licinianus p. 32.14 Flemisch.

²² Cf. App. BC 1.103.

²³ Sall. *Hist.* 2.21 M. [= 21 McG. = 19 R.].

serious, perhaps, is a passage in Cicero's speech for Roscius of Ameria, probably delivered in the first half of the year. The advocate appeals to the *nobiles* to resume their station and their duties in all confidence. So long as it was inevitable, a single man held sole power. But the situation has changed; Sulla has appointed magistrates and ordained laws.²⁴

It might be objected that Cicero proclaims an aspiration rather than a fact. However that may be, the elections in 80 BC reassured the aristocracy. The choice of the Roman People was guided towards Ap. Claudius Pulcher and P. Servilius Vatia. The former had been praetor in 89 BC; the latter, praetor in 90 BC, was the consular candidate supported by Sulla two years later.²⁵ Both [10] fought for the cause of the *nobiles*. More important, they were close to the core of the oligarchy. Servilius' mother was a Metella, and Ap. Pulcher had taken to wife her niece Caecilia, the daughter of Balaricus.²⁶ It may be presumed that no other candidates came forward.

With this pair of consuls is associated the retirement of Sulla. According to Appian, the people showed a disposition to elect him for a second term, but he declined and, appointing Claudius and Servilius, proceeded of his own free will to resign the supreme power.²⁷ And, in Orosius' brief phrase, this consular year saw Sulla a private citizen at last.²⁸ It is legitimate to infer that the dictator abdicated early in the year 79 BC—perhaps at the very beginning, certainly before the next elections.²⁹ There is only one other piece of evidence bearing on the question. Plutarch states that Sulla resolved to retire and leave the people in full control of the consular *comitia*. The next sentence adds that the success of Lepidus was expected, an audacious man, and hostile.³⁰ Then

²⁴ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 139: *dum necesse erat resque ipsa cogebat, unus omnia poterat: qui postea quam magistratus creavit legesque constituit, sua cuique procuratio auctoritasque est restituta* ['As long as it was necessary and the situation required it, one man controlled everything: when he appointed magistrates and passed laws, everyone was handed back their role and standing'].

[5] ²⁵ Plut. *Sull.* 10.3: *Νόνιον μὲν γε τὸν ἀδελφιδεῖον αὐτοῦ καὶ Σερουήϊον <Σερούϊλιον Mommsen> ἀρχὰς μετιόντας* ['they ignominiously rejected his nephew Nonius, and Servius [Servilius?], who were canvassing for public offices'].

²⁶ The significance of these relationships was first pointed out by Münzer, *RA* 302–5.

²⁷ App. *BC* 1.103: *Τῷ δ' ἑξῆς ἔτει ὁ μὲν δῆμος καὶ τότε τὸν Σύλλαν θεραπεύων ἤρεϊτο ὑπατεύειν, ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀνασχόμενος ὑπάτους μὲν αὐτοῖς ἀπέφηνε Σερονίλιον Ἰσαυρικὸν καὶ Κλαύδιον Ποῦλχρον, αὐτὸς δὲ τὴν μεγάλην ἀρχὴν οὐδενὸς ἐνοχλοῦντος ἐκὼν ἀπέθετο* ['The next year the people, in order to pay court to Sulla, elected him to the consulship again, but he refused the office, named for the consulship Servilius Isauricus and Claudius Pulcher, and voluntarily laid down the supreme power, without anyone giving him any trouble'].

²⁸ Oros. 5.21.1: *creati itaque Publio Servilio et Appio Claudio consulibus Lucius Sulla est tandem privatus* ['When P. Servilius and Appius Claudius had been elected consuls, Sulla at last became a private citizen'].

²⁹ Cf. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte* II⁸ (Berlin 1889) 367; English Translation IV² (London 1912), 138; H. M. Last, 'Sulla', *CAH IX* (Cambridge 1932) 261–312, at 309: 'when his consulship had expired Sulla laid down his dictatorial powers.'

³⁰ Plut. *Sull.* 34: *οὕτω δὲ ἄρα οὐ ταῖς πράξεσιν ὡς τοῖς εὐτυχίμασιν ἐπίστευεν, ὥστε, παμπόλων μὲν ἀνηρημένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καινοτομίας δὲ γενομένης καὶ μεταβολῆς ἐν τῇ πόλει τοσαύτης, ἀποθέσθαι τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἀρχαιρεσιῶν ὑπατικῶν ποιῆσαι κύριον, αὐτὸς δὲ μὴ*

follows an anecdote relative to Lepidus' election. If this were accurate, it would imply that Sulla retained [11] power for some months yet in 79 BC, almost until the elections. Closer scrutiny, however, will indicate that the nexus between Lepidus' candidature and Sulla's abdication is wholly fallacious.³¹

In 80 BC Sulla had been consul as well as dictator, perhaps more the one than the other. Tenure of the magistracy enabled him to modify the character of his regiment, to glide with discretion from despotism into legality, and to safeguard the delicate transition. A provincial governorship might have been attractive, for glory or for security. When Caesar Augustus restored the Republic he went away to his *provincia*, wisely (but he also retained the consulate). The Cisalpina dominated Italy: it was the basis from which to conquer Illyricum and, an imperial task, bind West to East by winning the land route to Macedonia. But Sulla Felix was satiated with glory. He envied no man, and he feared none. At Rome ten thousand freed slaves, the Cornelii, were his clients, and a hundred thousand veterans, established like garrisons throughout the land of Italy, knew him as their *imperator*, as their *patronus*.

[11a] Sulla preferred leisure to a proconsulate.³² The restored Republic passed a tranquil year under the guidance of those sound men Ap. Claudius Pulcher and P. Servilius Vatia; and Sulla died in the spring of 78 BC.

Sulla resigned because his work was done, his mandate fulfilled. The title of his office described his function and implied a brief duration. In a famous scene towards the end of his treatise *De re publica* Cicero brings on Scipio Aemilianus, narrating the dream that manifested itself when he was a military tribune in Africa. The elder Africanus utters a solemn prophecy from the celestial sphere. His grandson will be that one man on whom hangs the salvation of Rome; should he escape assassination, it will be his duty to set the state in order—*dictator rem publicam constituas oportet*. The fiction is

προσελθεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγορᾷ τὸ σῶμα παρέχων τοῖς βουλομένοις ὑπεύθυνον ὥσπερ ἰδιώτης ἀναστρέφεσθαι. καὶ τις παρὰ γνώμην αὐτοῦ θρασὺς ἀνὴρ καὶ πολέμιος ἐπίδοξος ἦν ὕπατος αἰρήσεσθαι, Μάρκος Λέπιδος, οὐ δι' ἑαυτόν, ἀλλὰ Πομπηίῳ σπουδάζοντι καὶ δεομένῳ τοῦ δήμου χαριζομένου. διὸ καὶ χαίροντα τῇ νίκῃ τὸν Πομπηίον ὁ Σύλλας ἰδὼν ἀπίοντα κτλ. ['He put more confidence in his good fortunes than in his achievements to such an extent, that, although he had killed a great number of people, introduced major innovations and changes in the government of the city, he laid down his office, and put the people in control of the consular elections; when they were held, he did not go near them himself, but walked up and down the forum like a private man, offering his person freely to all who wished to call him to account. Contrary to his wishes, a bold man, and an enemy of his, Marcus Lepidus, was tipped to be elected consul, not because of his own merits, but owing to the favourable response of the people to Pompey's canvassing on his behalf. And so, when Sulla saw Pompey rejoicing for the victory, as he was leaving the voting assembly...'].]

³¹ See further below [the reference must be to 'M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 78 BC)'].

³² The Cisalpina was not his province until he should chose to leave the city, *paludatus*, after the passing of a *lex curiata*. Of which there is no evidence. The statement of Piganiol, 'toutefois il garda comme province la Gaule Cisalpine, mais ne s'y rendit pas' (*La conquête romaine*, Paris 1940³, 337), seems void of meaning as well as proof. Sulla gave up everything.

transparent but instructive.³³ Aemilianus proclaimed that the ancestral constitution was the best of all.³⁴ That was also Cicero's opinion. He was not insinuating that Scipio Aemilianus ought to establish monarchic rule.

But if, from a later point of vantage, one [12] contemplated the succession of military leaders from Sulla to Caesar and Caesar Augustus, the emergence of an emperor to rule a universal empire seemed logical and inevitable. Appian, with the whole process before his eyes, living and writing in the age of Antoninus, when the monarchy had subsisted as a legitimate form of government for nearly two centuries, cannot master his amazement.³⁵ It was all in Sulla's hand: he had seized supreme power, why did he give it up? Appian's astonishment finds recent emulators. The appeal to his authority does him little credit. When Appian deserts the business of compilation and undertakes to think for himself, the results are not always advantageous.

[13] As long as Sulla held the dictatorship, his rule was absolute, his competence universal, reviving the integral *imperium* of the ancient kings. Nobody ever had any doubts. The best witness is a contemporary, in a speech delivered under the dictatorship. His language is temperate and precise—*cum solus rem publicam regeret orbemque terrarum gubernaret*.³⁶ A later pronouncement on despots may be added—*Cinnam meminī: vidi Sullam: modo Caesarem. hi enim tres post civitatem a L. Bruto liberatam plus potuerunt quam universa res publica*.³⁷ It would be a superfluous and pedestrian industry to compile a florilegium of passages denouncing the tyranny of Sulla, his *regnum* or his *dominatio*. Generously and even gaily tossed backwards and forwards in the verbal warfare of Roman politicians, those opprobrious terms apply in all propriety and earnestness to the rule of Sulla the Dictator. That man scorned disguise. When the property of a proscribed citizen was [14] put up for sale, he intervened with the cynical words, 'it's booty, and it's mine'.³⁸ All too rare in the corpus of anecdotes which convention honours as 'historical', the story is authenticated—doubly: it was told by a contemporary and subjected to the test of publicity.

Sulla left behind him a hideous memory. As Pliny the Elder observes, there is nobody but loathes him.³⁹ It may be contended that the influence of Cicero

[7] ³³ Cic. *Rep.* 6.12 ['it is becoming that you should resettle the commonwealth as dictator'].

³⁴ Cic. *Rep.* 1.34. ³⁵ App. *BC* 1.103.

³⁶ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 131 ['when he was single-handedly ruling the commonwealth and governing the world'].

³⁷ Cic. *Phil.* 5.17 ['I remember Cinna, I have seen Sulla, and lately Caesar; for these three had more power since the city was freed by Lucius Brutus than the commonwealth as a whole']; cf. 2.108.

³⁸ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.81: *tantum animi habuit ad audaciam ut dicere in contione non dubitaret bona civium Romanorum cum venderet, se praedam suam vendere* ['He had such courage in his audacity, that he did not hesitate to say at a public meeting, when he was selling the property of Roman citizens, that he was selling his own booty'].

³⁹ Plin. *Nat.* 7.137: *cum Sullam nemo non oderit* ['since there was no one who did not hate Sulla'].

dominates the literary tradition.⁴⁰ That is not enough. The *nobiles*, his allies, gaining from Sulla's actions restoration and enrichment, were impotent to defend and justify their champion.⁴¹ They hardly seem to have made the effort. Thirty years later the name of Sulla was a deadly weapon—in the hands of their adversaries. There is no evidence that the oligarchs appealed to his memory and credit.⁴² Sulla's victory was the victory of a faction, small in numbers and thereby invidious. Cicero in the speech for Roscius strikes a warning note—he is bold enough to refer to the unpopularity of the *nobiles*.⁴³

[14a] Sulla's despotism admits no disguise and needs no palliation. Its very excesses are explained by the time and the season—a decade preceding, full of war and revolution. Sulla's tyranny was a temporary remedy, designed not for duration but as a means of restoring the ancestral constitution, with necessary amendments. In his summary review of absolutism at Rome the historian Tacitus puts things in the true perspective, tyranny for tyranny Sulla being comparable to Cinna in the brevity of his rule—*non Cinnae, non Sullae longa dominatio*.⁴⁴ That the aims and achievements of the two despots were not comparable is irrelevant.

[15] Between Sulla the despot and Sulla the *nobilis* there subsists no clash or inconsistency other than that which can so often be observed between means and ends. If, however, the superficial be accorded primacy, it can be argued that Sulla, on the evidence of his character and actions, had no thought whatsoever of regulating the commonwealth for the benefit of the aristocracy; that, discerning the trend of the times, he aspired to monarchy and tried to establish it, in permanence.⁴⁵

A variety of considerations has been invoked in favour of this theory. The introductory pronouncement can be briefly disposed of. It is contended that none of all the ancient authorities supplies any support for the view that Sulla took the dictatorship in order to restore the rule of the oligarchy.⁴⁶ The claim is excessive. Cicero's speech for Roscius of Ameria should provide the refutation. Sulla's victory and the *causa nobilium* are there identified, more than once.⁴⁷ Perhaps there is equivocation—the orator, in the interests of his case,

⁴⁰ Cf. H. M. Last, 'Sulla', *CAH IX* (Cambridge 1932) 261–312, at 281.

⁴¹ As was said of a later reign of terror (Tac. *Ann.* 1.10): *proscriptionem civium, divisiones agrorum ne ipsis quidem qui fecere laudatas* ['the proscription of citizens, the distributions of land were not praised even by those who carried them out'].

⁴² Cf. *RR* 65, 190.

⁴³ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 149: *et res publica ex illis et ipsi ex invidia minus laborarent* ['the commonwealth would be less harassed by them, and they themselves would be less harassed by envy'].

⁴⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 1.1 ['neither Cinna nor Sulla had a long rule'].

[8] ⁴⁵ J. Carcopino, *Sulla ou la monarchie manquée* (Paris 1931); *Histoire romaine II*, 1 (Paris 1929), [445–88]; 2nd ed. (Paris 1940), 453–[98].

⁴⁶ J. Carcopino, *Sylla* 37: 'l'idée que Sylla ne s'est saisi de la dictature que pour restaurer l'oligarchie est étrangère à l'antiquité.'

⁴⁷ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 135–42.

casts a veil over the truth, and pretends that the *nobiles* have been restored to status, [16] property, and power, whereas in reality (as he knows and as they know) Sulla is the victor and Sulla intends to perpetuate his domination. If the point be conceded, nothing is gained or lost. There is a notorious but neglected passage in Suetonius. When certain eminent personages interceded with the Dictator, urging him to spare the life of the young Caesar, Sulla at last gave way before their importunity, but warned them, heavily and portentously: there was many a Marius in that young man, the day would come when Caesar would annihilate the party of the Optimates, Sulla's cause and theirs.⁴⁸

Take as you will the anecdote, and the Dictator's infallible prescience, *sive divinitus sive aliqua coniectura*, one at least among the writers of antiquity fancied that Sulla was the champion of the oligarchy. If others have refrained from insisting on Sulla's aims and allegiance it may be counted, not as contradiction but a score on the side of virtue: they eschewed the obvious. [17] Most of them had little space to spare, for they were composing elementary historical manuals. When they made a curt reference to Sulla's work, calling it *res publica constituta* or the like, they were not victims of an ambiguity,⁴⁹ or propagators of error. To any who used the Latin tongue the phrase could hardly suggest a connotation other than aristocratic or oligarchic. Cicero testifies—and so does Augustus.

If Sulla sought to perpetuate his rule and impose absolutism at Rome, how far did he go, and why did he stop?

It was to be monarchy, and monarchy by right divine. The true founder of the imperial cult, it is solemnly averred, was not Caesar, not Caesar Augustus, but Sulla Felix:⁵⁰ and his *cognomen* matches the name 'Augustus', only to surpass it in potency.⁵¹ In the eastern lands the proconsul had not failed

⁴⁸ Suet. *DJ* 1.3: *satis constat Sullam, cum deprecantibus amicissimis et ornatissimis viris aliquamdiu denegasset atque illi pertinaciter contenderent, expugnatum tandem exclamasse sive divinitus sive aliqua coniectura: vincerent ac sibi haberent, dum modo scirent eum, quem incolumem tanto opere cuperent, quandoque optimatum partibus, quas secum simul defendissent, exitio futurum; nam Caesari multos Marios inesse* ['It is well attested that Sulla, although he had long held out against the prayers of his closest and most distinguished friends, finally gave in, and declared (whether divinely inspired or through some kind of conjecture) that they could have their way, but should be aware that the man they so desired to save, believing him to be attached to the cause of the Optimates for which they had fought with him, will be its demise; for in Caesar there were many Mariuses'].

⁴⁹ For example, Livy *Per.* 89: *legibus novis rei publicae statum confirmavit* ['he strengthened the setup of the commonwealth with new laws']; *Vir. Ill.* 75.11: *re publica ordinata dictatorem deposuit* ['having ordered the commonwealth he resigned the dictatorship']; Eutr. 6.1.1: *cum Sulla rem publicam composuisset* ['after Sulla had settled the commonwealth'].

⁵⁰ J. Carcopino, *Sylla* 86, cf. 93.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 113: 'la divinité d'Octave l'Auguste n'est qu'indirecte et passive. Celle de Sylla l'Heureux est agissante et manifeste.' Further, the *cognomen* is described as 'le symbole immédiat de sa monarchie de droit divin.' Note also the chapter headings 'Droits régaliens et droit divin', 'Sylla divinisé', 'Le culte syllanien'.

to notice the Hellenistic autocracies; he proposed to transplant the system to Italy.⁵²

The kindred topics of the Hellenistic monarchy and the official cult of the ruler have evoked much writing, not all of it immune from [18] misconceptions. This is not the place to pass in review the evidence and arguments put up for 'Sulla the Precursor'. *Felix*, for example, of which so much is made comes down to very little in the end.⁵³ A general question, however may be permitted: what did any Roman of that age see to admire and imitate in the Orient? The thrones once founded by the marshals of Alexander had collapsed or were rotten and ridiculous. Nor were the newer states, half Greek and half barbarian, at all impressive. When propraetor of Cilicia Sulla comported himself with true Roman arrogance in his dealings with the envoy of the Parthian, the King of Kings,⁵⁴ and Mithridates, the ruler of Pontus, whose armies the proconsul dispersed with such easy confidence could not compete in absolutism with the powers of a Roman dictator as conferred by the *Lex Valeria*.⁵⁵

It is more instructive to enquire how the aspirant to autocracy was arrested in his course, blocked, baffled, and compelled to abdicate. The old gang, it is suggested, did the trick, with the help of young Pompeius.

The theory demands sympathetic consideration—for one reason. It discards that conception of Roman history which sees in the last age of the Republic [19] a sequel of Plutarchian biographies; it appeals to the solid realities of oligarchic politics, to the great families, their allies and dependents, their resources in peace and war. For survival and for power the Metelli had taken up Sulla: they might prove strong enough to cast aside their instrument when he outlived utility or exceeded his mandate.

To argue that the Dictator was thwarted by a conspiracy of the oligarchs demands some manipulation of the chronology. As so many of the dates are insecure, it is possible to distribute the events of 80 and 79 BC in more ways than one. A coherent construction can therefore be built up which seems at first sight to defy disproof.

This is how it is done.⁵⁶ Sulla did not abdicate at the very beginning of 79 BC, he held on for more than six months longer. He was still dictator when the consuls were elected for 78 BC, Catulus and Lepidus. But the political scene

⁵² *Ibid.* 43: 'Sylla, qui avait réfléchi sur les leçons d'un récent passé, et qu'avaient instruit, de surcroît, sa fréquentation des Hellènes et ses expériences de la guerre de Mithridate, a tâché d'implanter en Italie l'autocratie des grandes monarchies orientales.'

⁵³ 'On Sulla's worship of Fortuna and on *Felix* cf. the remarks of A. Passerini, 'Il concetto antico di Fortuna', *Philologus* 90 (1935), 90–7. Passerini argues that Sulla's luck is not a Hellenistic concept but a native, semi-magical quality: cf. the story of Sulla and Valeria in Plut. *Sull.* 35.

[10] ⁵⁴ Plut. *Sull.* 6.

⁵⁵ Even in Pontus there was no appeal from Chancellor to King: cf. Strabo 13.1.55, p. 609 (on Metrodorus of Scepsis, who held that high office).

⁵⁶ J. Carcopino, *Sylla* 186–211; *Histoire romaine* II, 1² (1940), 486–[88].

underwent a rapid transformation. The following concatenation of events brought about his downfall.

[20] Early in the year (and not in 80 BC) should belong the prosecution of Roscius of Ameria, which recoiled upon the head of its instigator, Sulla's rapacious freedman Chrysogonus, thereby enabling the *nobiles* to make a firm protest against despotism, all the more effective because their action was not wantonly provocative. The Roscii were bound by ties of *clientela* to the Metelli and other aristocratic houses;⁵⁷ Roscius himself had taken refuge in the house of Caecilia Metella,⁵⁸ and the advocate for the defence was supported in court by a cluster of young *nobiles*, the fine flower of Roman society.⁵⁹

Discontent was advertised; and disloyalty soon broke out in overt acts. M. Aemilius Lepidus returned from his province of Sicily. Two of the Metelli, the brothers Nepos and Celer, started a prosecution, only to drop it.⁶⁰ They were dissuaded by Pompeius, who about this time renewed his alliance with the principal family in the oligarchy: he married Mucia, the half-sister of the two Metelli.⁶¹ Pompeius himself at last celebrated his triumph (12 March).⁶²

[21] The consuls Ap. Pulcher and P. Servilius, previously recalcitrant, now encouraged his claim.⁶³ The Metelli, their kinsmen and allies, with the two consuls and the military adventurer were thus aligned against the Dictator. Sulla's position was shaken. The death of Caecilia Metella (at the end of 81 BC) had impaired his compact with her family⁶⁴—and the excellent Q. Metellus Pius, on whom he might have relied, was no longer there, having departed to Spain at the very beginning of the year.

The consular elections now drew near. M. Aemilius Lepidus came forward with a violent campaign of invective against the tyranny of Sulla; and he was actively helped by Pompeius. A formidable coalition became manifest, the Metelli and Lepidus, with Pompeius as the connecting link.

Sulla's enemies induced the Senate to vote him the province of Gallia Cisalpina. Sulla was not deceived or appeased. The coalition carried the election of Lepidus—and Sulla abdicated forthwith, rebuking Pompeius for his criminal lack of foresight. He might have appealed to arms—the veterans would rise and fight for their [22] *imperator*. But was it worth it after all? Monarchy presupposes heredity, and Sulla now reflected that his son Faustus was only a young boy. The fallen despot retired to write his memoirs. That interesting document might have disclosed uncomfortable truths: it was revised and emended by Lucullus, the cousin of Pius, to screen the oligarchs

⁵⁷ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 15.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 27.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 1; 77; 149. See further ['The Speech for Roscius of Ameria', n. 36–7].

⁶⁰ Ps.-Asc. 206 [Orelli = 259.1–3 Stangl].

⁶¹ See [below, p. 68].

⁶² For the date see [below, p. 70].

⁶³ This is deduced from Plut. *Pomp.* 14 and Frontin. *Strat.* 4.5.1; cf. [below, p. 73].

⁶⁴ Cf. [no. 5, 'The Speech for Roscius of Ameria', p. 89].

and mislead posterity.⁶⁵ The historical exposition here summarised appears to crowd many events into the first half of the year 79 BC. In itself that objection is superficial and invalid. A political crisis involves just such a condensation before the final explosion. But it remains to prove that there was a political crisis.

The reconstruction has been acclaimed as importing order, even certitude, into the chronology of Sulla's dictatorship.⁶⁶ It must be examined step by step. To take various minor items first. The date of Metellus Pius' departure to Spain is not certain—he might have left before the end of his consular term, a procedure in no way abnormal, still less forbidden, as some have supposed, by the ordinances of Sulla.⁶⁷ Nor does Lepidus' tenure of Sicily admit precision. If he was praetor in 81 BC, he might have governed the province in the following year, leaving it either before the end of 80 BC, or early in 79 BC. But the date of [22] Lepidus' praetorship has not been recorded; and he might have governed Sicily in 81/80 BC, soon after Pompeius had pacified the island.⁶⁸ As far as concerns the prosecution, a secret intervention by Pompeius—or by other politicians—in Lepidus' favour is not unlikely, even though the sole and scanty evidence states that the Metelli desisted when they saw how popular Lepidus was.⁶⁹ Nor does the date of Pompeius' marriage to Mucia, the half-sister of Celer and Nepos, have to be put as late as the spring of 79 BC, or brought into close connection with this transaction. When Pompeius came back from Africa (?spring or summer, 80 BC), he had been a widower for many months. The means are not available for calculating precisely how long he chose to remain in that condition before contracting another match in the ambit of the Metelli. All that is safe to say is that, if his marriage to Mucia cannot fall later than 79 BC, because of the difficulty of fitting in the births of three children before the end of 77 BC, then a date in 80 BC causes less embarrassment.⁷⁰

⁶⁵ Carcopino, *Sylla* 231–8.

⁶⁶ Cf. a reviewer [J. Gagé] in *RH* 171 (1933), 211: 'toute la dictature est maintenant jalonnée de dates sûres'.

[11] ⁶⁷ Cf., on this topic, H.M. Last, *CAH IX*, 294–5; J.P.V.D. Balsdon, ['Consular Provinces under the Late Republic, I. General Considerations',] *JRS* [29 (1939), 57–73, at 58–65]. As for Pius, all that can be said is that he was still in Rome for the praetorian elections in 80 BC: *Cic. Planc.* 69.

⁶⁸ When Pompeius departed for Africa, he left Memmius in charge, his sister's husband: *Plut. Pomp.* 11. This was C. Memmius L. f., later his quaestor in Spain, where he was killed in 75 BC [*Plut. Sert.* 21.1; *Oros.* 5.23.12].

⁶⁹ *Ps.-Asc.* 206 [Orelli = 259.1–3 Stangl]: *accusari coeperat a duobus Metellis, Celere et Nepote; qui cum legibus interrogassent, vicit eius apud populum gratia, destiterunt* ['initially he was accused by two Metelli, Celer, and Nepos, who made him undergo a preliminary public interrogation; the favour of the people for him prevailed, and they gave up'].

⁷⁰ Carcopino constricts most inhumanly the conjugal life of Pompeius and Mucia, between the first months of 79 BC and the beginning of 77 BC: *Sylla*, 188–93. It can be expanded at both ends—summer 80 BC to autumn 77 BC—with an interruption caused by the fighting in Italy in 77 BC.

[24] That all the Metelli, except of course Pius (who was fortunately absent as well as above any reproach of disloyalty) now turned against the Dictator, is a sore strain on belief. With the Metelli go their consuls, P. Servilius and Ap. Claudius Pulcher. A story is preserved that Servilius, who had been against Pompeius' triumph, actually expressed approval when the time came, commending Pompeius for his firm attitude in the face of excessive demands from the soldiers.⁷¹ This is not much to build on; and it is hardly legitimate to enhance the theme by assuming that Sulla had chosen those two consuls, some nine months earlier, precisely because of their opposition to Pompeius.⁷²

[24a] Nothing that is known about Servilius and Ap. Pulcher suggests that political hazards appealed to them. Quite the reverse. They had seen tribulation—and had acquired the supreme magistracy after a long delay. Servilius was about fifty-five years old; his colleague was by no means robust—illness at Tarentum delayed his journey to his province, and he died in Macedonia.⁷³ The only recorded action of the consuls is cautious and negative: fearing trouble, they advised Pompeius to give way in the face of seditious troops.⁷⁴ Servilius' praise of Pompeius condemned his own lack of vigour.

Finally, the allocation of Gallia Cisalpina. Nobody can prove when this took place, or why. But there are probabilities. It is contended that the Senate awarded the province to Sulla in the summer of 79 BC, and the *Lex Sempronia* is called in to help.⁷⁵ That law has no direct bearing on any grant of a province that might be supposed to have been made to Sulla in 79 BC. The *Lex Sempronia* provided that provinces should be designated in advance for consuls before they were elected—on this occasion the men who would hold office at Rome during the year 78 BC. [24b] The only remedy would be to suppose an extraordinary allocation—the date of which would still remain conjectural. On the other hand, the appeal to the *Lex Sempronia*, as conferring the Cisalpina on Sulla, would carry a different date, not 79 BC but 81 BC, just before the elections which produced as consuls Sulla and Metellus Pius.⁷⁶

The sole evidence is a sentence from the epitomator Granius Licinianus—Sulla had been assigned the Cisalpina.⁷⁷ The tense is instructive. His narrative, though compressed, permits an easy solution. Granius was referring to the allocation of provinces before the consular elections in 79 BC. What more

[12] ⁷¹ Plut. *Pomp.* 14; also *Apophthegm. Cn. Pompei* 5a.

⁷² Carcopino, *Sylla* 195: 'Vatia et son cousin Pulcher avaient été élus sur l'ordre du dictateur à cause de l'irritation qu'ils disaient éprouver de la fringale ambitieuse de Pompée.'

⁷³ Sall. *Hist.* 1.115 M. [= 115 McG. = 103 R.].

⁷⁴ Above, n. 71 and below, n. 101.

⁷⁵ Carcopino, *Sylla* 202; *Histoire romaine* II, 1² (1940), 496: 'le sénat, comme la combinaison des lois Sempronia et Cornelia de provinciis lui en créait l'obligation, procéda à la désignation des provinces qui, à leur sortie de charge, écherraient aux futurs magistrats et attribua la Gaule Cisalpine, sans doute pour 78, au dictateur.'

⁷⁶ Cf. [below, p. 74].

⁷⁷ Granius p. 32.14 Flemisch: [*data erat et Sullae provincia Gallia Cisalpina*].

natural than that Gallia Cisalpina was now set aside as one of the two consular provinces, to be held in due course by the consuls of 78 BC? Metellus Pius had Hispania Ulterior, perhaps the whole peninsula, as his *provincia*, while Macedonia and Cilicia went to Ap. Claudius and P. Servilius, the consuls of 79 BC. And, in fact, the Cisalpina seems to have been Lepidus' province.⁷⁸

[25] The principal pillars remain—the trial of Roscius, the attitude of Pompeius, and the candidature of M. Aemilius Lepidus. The first collapses impressively. It is argued that the Roscius affair belongs not to 80 BC but to 79. The cardinal text is a passage in Aulus Gellius.⁷⁹ Examination will show that it proves 80 BC after all. As the revised dating of the *Pro Roscio Amerino* has found wide approbation, it will be proper to reserve this question for a separate enquiry.⁸⁰ [26] More intricate are the problems of Pompeius and Lepidus. The day of Pompeius' triumph from Africa has been recorded, 12 March, but not the year.⁸¹ Indirect testimony favours 79 BC; but 80 and even 81 have found advocates.⁸² Were the chronology fixed, the evidence for certain delicate matters, namely the relations of Pompeius and Lepidus with the dictator and with each other, turns out to be unworthy of the confidence with which it has been generally utilised in reconstructions old and new. Was Sulla still dictator when Pompeius celebrated his triumph—and when Lepidus won his consulate?⁸³ A deplorable vagueness pervades the ancient sources.

Pompeius played an important part in the last campaign in Italy, though not present at the Colline Gate. Soon afterwards he was despatched to Sicily, with a regular command.⁸⁴ Perperna fled before his approach, Cn. Carbo he took and killed. It all happened very quickly. If Appian is correct, it was not until the death of Carbo was announced at Rome that, no consuls being left alive, an *interrex* was duly appointed, L. Flaccus—who proceeded to arrange for Sulla's [27] installation as dictator.⁸⁵ It is implied that the consular year of Carbo and young Marius (82 BC) had not yet ended. The Battle of the Colline Gate took place on 1 November. The margin of time seems rather narrow. One might be tempted to doubt whether Sulla in the midst of arms and murder was

⁷⁸ Cf. [no. 6, 'M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 78 BC)'].

⁷⁹ Gell. 15.28.3.

⁸⁰ Below, [no. 5, 'The Speech for Roscius of Ameria'].

[13] ⁸¹ Granius Licinianus p. 31.1–3 Flemisch.

⁸² For 81 BC, C. Lanzani, 'Silla e Pompeo. La spedizione di Sicilia e d'Africa', *Historia* 7 (1933), 343–62; ead., *Lucio Cornelio Silla dittatore* (Milan 1936) [40, 45–6]; for 80 BC, T. Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic I* (Oxford 1923) 376; A. Piganiol, *La conquête romaine*³ (Paris 1940) 336; for 79 BC, Mommsen, *CIL I*², p. 178 and *Röm. Gesch.* II⁸ (Berlin 1889) 333; English Translation IV² (London 1912) 94; H. M. Last, *CAH IX*, 280 (while conceding that 80 BC is possible). Gelzer assumes the correctness of 79 BC without debate: [see 'Pompeius Strabo und der Aufstieg seines Sohnes Magnus', cit., 26 = *Vom römischen Staat*, 89 = *Kleine Schriften* II, 132].

⁸³ The very existence of these problems is ignored or obscured in certain modern accounts, for example in Fröhlich's article on Sulla, *RE III*, 1564.

⁸⁴ Livy *Per.* 89: *in Siciliam cum imperio a senatu missus* ['he was sent to Sicily by the Senate with an official command'].

[14] ⁸⁵ App. *BC* 1.98.

thus inhibited by legal purism, refusing to contemplate the dictatorship until a fugitive and proscribed consul had been authentically eliminated: it would have been enough to declare, or assume, that Carbo was juridically non-existent as a man or as a consul.⁸⁶

Whatever be the truth about this episode, Sicily can have offered scant resistance. Africa was a more serious matter. Yet Plutarch affirms that Pompeius defeated the Marian faction and regulated the affairs of the native princes, all in the space of forty days.⁸⁷ Accepting this, Pompeius might return to Italy and triumph on 12 March 81 BC. Exaggeration will be surmised; indeed, he was still in Africa in 80 BC. A fragment of Sallust's *Histories* shows Sulla when consul proposing a law about the recall of Pompeius.⁸⁸

[28] How long Pompeius stayed in Sicily, how long in Africa evades computation. The precision of a narrative which puts the landing in Africa in October of 81 BC is delusive.⁸⁹ Why should Pompeius have lingered for nearly a year in Sicily? The invasion needed to be carefully prepared; and Pompeius was a careful organiser of supply and transport. But undue delay would enable the adversary to gather force for a long struggle, in the perennial fashion of African warfare.

Not but what the notion of a rapid conquest may be correct. If so, that is not enough to support the dating of Pompeius' triumph to March, 80 BC. There are other factors. Plutarch records with circumstantial detail the clash between the victorious general and the Roman government. Sulla instructed Pompeius to disband all his legions but one, and await a successor. The soldiers expressed discontent, and there were ambiguous rumours about Pompeius' attitude. But Pompeius maintained discipline, and in some way, so it seems, honour was satisfied on all sides, Pompeius returning with his army.⁹⁰ Sulla, it is averred, perceiving the popularity of the young general, and artfully diverting [29] the stream which he could not arrest, resolved to outbid the flatterers; he went out to meet Pompeius and hailed him as *Magnus*.⁹¹

This was not the end of trouble. Pompeius was only a *privatus cum imperio*, he had not held a magistracy. But he wanted a triumph. Sulla objected. He said that he would prevent it. Then Pompeius, insolent and unperturbed, reminded Sulla that men look to the rising, not the setting sun. Sulla did not catch the

⁸⁶ As having been proscribed—or perhaps as *per tumultum creatus*.

⁸⁷ Plut. *Pomp.* 12. The figure recurs. Pompeius asserts in his despatch to the Senate that he got together the army for Spain in forty days: Sall. *Hist.* 2.82.4 M. [= 82.4 McG. = 70.4 R.].

⁸⁸ Sall. *Hist.* 2.21 M. [= 21 McG. = 19 R.].

⁸⁹ These dates are stated by Carcopino, *Sylla* 140.

⁹⁰ Plut. *Pomp.* 13, cf. Cic. *Man.* 61: *victorem exercitum deportavit* ['he led the army home victorious'].

⁹¹ Plut. *Pomp.* 13.4: πάντας ἀνθρώπους αἰσθανόμενος δέχεσθαι καὶ παραπέμπειν τὸν Πομπήϊον ὠρμημένους μετ' εὐνοίας, ἔσπευδεν ὑπερβαλέσθαι κτλ. ['when he realised that everybody was rushing to welcome Pompey and accompany him home with goodwill, he endeavoured to outdo them...'].

remark, but noting amazement on the faces of all around, asked what had been said. They told him. Dismayed by the audacity of Pompeius, he exclaimed, not once but twice, 'let him have his triumph'.⁹²

Such is the story. Plutarch tells it—and tells it very well. The novel and entertaining figure of the intimidated Sulla need not detain or perplex the enquiry. Literary artifice has been at work. What matter is this—Sulla's opposition (which may well be authentic) and Pompeius' eventual triumph. Did Sulla in fact give his consent?

Sulla had welcomed Pompeius' aid—a private army of three legions—in the reconquest of Italy; he honoured the young man, and engaged him in the flattering toils of a family compact. [30] Allies or agents in a civil war are not always amenable after victory when a leader desires to establish order for himself, or for the Republic. Octavianus was embarrassed by the military glory of M. Licinius Crassus, the proconsul of Macedonia. He thwarted the claim for *spolia opima*, but had to concede a triumph.⁹³ As for Sulla, Plutarch mentions in the same sentence the fate of Ofella, the brush with Pompeius, and—an incident otherwise unrecorded—the attempt to deprive Dolabella of a maritime command.⁹⁴ Nothing more likely than that Sulla had to face the inordinate ambition of Pompeius, sinister son of a sinister parent;⁹⁵ and it need not be doubted that Sulla passed him over in his will.⁹⁶ But Sulla gave way, so it is said. Where is the explanation?

Once again chronology is dominant, the date of the triumph. Various epitomators give Pompeius' age on this occasion, twenty-four, -five or -six.⁹⁷ If one of them turns out to be correct, the result will be put down to accident rather than to science. There is no criterion. They may have been misled by adopting for Pompeius' triumph the age at which he invaded Sicily or won his victory in Africa. A graver error lies [31] at the root. Pompeius was born on 29 September 106 BC.⁹⁸ This was pretty well known. Yet, as Velleius Paterculus,

⁹² Plut. *Pomp.* 14.3: πυθόμενος δὲ καὶ καταπλαγείς τοῦ Πομπηίου τὴν τόλμαν ἀνεβόησε δις ἐφεξῆς, 'Θριαμβεύσάτω' ['When he learned that, he was shocked by the boldness of Pompey, and cried out twice in succession: "Let him triumph!"'].

⁹³ Cass. Dio 51.24.4; cf. *CIL* 1², p.77.

[15] ⁹⁴ Plutarch, *Comp. Lysandri et Sullae* 2.4: Σύλλας δὲ καὶ Πομπηίου περιέκοψε τὸ στρατιωτικὸν φθονήσας, καὶ Δολοβέλλα τὴν ναυαρχίαν ἐπεχείρησε δοῦς ἀφελέσθαι, καὶ Λουκρήτιον Ὀφέλλαν ἀντὶ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ὑπατειῶν μνόμενον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀποσφάξαι προσέταξε ['Sulla cut down the contingent of Pompey's soldiers out of jealousy, and tried to take away from Dolabella the naval command which he had given him, and when Lucretius Ofella sought the consulship as a reward for many great services, ordered him to be killed before his eyes'].

⁹⁵ If one may parody the quotation at the beginning of Plutarch's *Pompeius*, 1: 'Ἐχθροῦ πατρός μοι τοῦτο φίλτατον τέκνον.' (Aeschylus [F 196 Nauck: 'This son, my dearest friend, of a father who is my enemy'])).

⁹⁶ As affirmed by Plut. *Pomp.* 15.2–3; *Sull.* 38.1.

⁹⁷ The evidence is conveniently summarised by Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic*, I (Oxford 1923) 375–6.

⁹⁸ Plin. *Nat.* 37.13; cf. 7.98.

himself no recondite antiquary, points out, there were writers who imagined that Pompeius was five years younger.⁹⁹ It was not mere ignorance—adulation operated, rejuvenating the hero and elevating him to comparison with Alexander the Macedonian. The strictures of Velleius are more than justified. A source followed by Appian actually reduces the age of Magnus by seven years.¹⁰⁰

This avenue is barred for legitimate traffic. For the decision between 80 and 79 BC, the only route available is casual and indirect. According to Plutarch, Servilius felt constrained to admire Pompeius for his behaviour on the occasion of the triumph.¹⁰¹ The soldiery clamoured for more money, but Pompeius stood firm: he said that he would sooner sacrifice his triumph. Frontinus also has the story, with a welcome detail. Along with Servilius he mentions a Claudius: both of them advised Pompeius to give way.¹⁰² [32] The mention of Ap. Pulcher and P. Servilius is notable, perhaps decisive.¹⁰³ They are the consuls of 79 BC.

A dilemma arises. If Pompeius' triumph was celebrated on 12 March 80 BC, it cannot belong to the conspiracy that broke the dictator—nor does it, if 79 is the date, for Sulla had abdicated already. The Plutarchian anecdote, Pompeius cowing Sulla, presupposes the dictator in all his omnipotence. Naturally, for it is an anecdote. Yet Sulla might have accorded consent, grudgingly, only to retard its effect. The case of M. Licinius Crassus is a parallel, though incomplete. He held his triumph in July, 27 BC under the restored Republic.¹⁰⁴ It will be assumed that Augustus had already departed from Rome, preferring not to witness the spectacle. Similarly Sulla; indeed, for all that can be known, he evaded the responsibility, from scruple, impatience, or frivolity.¹⁰⁵ The fact that Pompeius did not celebrate his triumph until March, 79 BC, suggests that there had been opposition or delay. The triumph of Pompeius was not easily to be reconciled with the constitution Sulla had established; he bequeathed the commonwealth to the care of the consuls, good oligarchs, it should seem; let them decide. So Ap. Pulcher and P. Servilius seem concerned with the actual

⁹⁹ Vell. 2.53.4. ¹⁰⁰ App. *Mithr.* 116.

¹⁰¹ Plut. *Pomp.* 14: ὅτε δὲ καὶ Σερούλιος, ἀνὴρ ἐπιφανὴς καὶ μάλιστα πρὸς τὸν θριάμβον ἐνστάς τοῦ Πομπηίου, νῦν ἔφη τὸν Πομπηῖον ὀρᾶν καὶ μέγαν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄξιον τοῦ θριάμβου [‘Then Servilius, a distinguished man, who had been most opposed to Pompey’s triumph, said he now saw that Pompey was truly great, and worthy of the triumph’]. Cf. *Apophth.* Cn. *Pompei* 5a.

[16] ¹⁰² Frontin. *Strat.* 4.5.1: Cn. *Pompeius* minantibus direpturos pecuniam militibus quae in triumpho ferretur, Servilio et Glaucia < Claudio, Gundermann > cohortantibus, ut divideret eam ne seditio fieret, adfirmavit non triumphaturum se potius et moriturum quam licentiae militum succumberet [‘When the soldiers of Pompey threatened to plunder the money which was to be carried in the triumph, Servilius and Glaucia [Claudius?] urged him to distribute it among the troops, in order to avoid the outbreak of a revolt. Pompey declared he would forgo the triumph, and would rather die than yield to the insubordination of his soldiers’].

¹⁰³ As is assumed, for example, by Gelzer, cf. above, n. [82]. ¹⁰⁴ CIL 1², p. 77.

¹⁰⁵ It should be noted that no author but Plutarch records Sulla’s opposition and Pompeius’ defiant attitude.

celebration, not [33] Sulla. The limitations of knowledge must, however, be sharply and severally defined. Arguments based on the presumed duration of operations in Sicily and Africa, or the alleged age of Pompeius have no validity. The only justification for putting his triumph in 79 rather than in 80 BC is the mention of Ap. Claudius Pulcher and P. Servilius, who happen to be the consuls of that year.

Pompeius cannot yet be dismissed from the scene. He is involved, at least according to Plutarch, in the candidature and election of M. Aemilius Lepidus. Despite strong opposition from Sulla, Pompeius threw in his popularity on Lepidus' side in the campaign and secured his election. When Pompeius was returning from the polls exultant in his victory, Sulla rebuked him. 'A fine piece of work in truth, to get Lepidus into the consulate before Catulus, the vilest of all men before the best. Pompeius had better be careful—his action only lent strength to a rival'. And in fact, after Sulla died, the armed revolution of Lepidus verified his predictions. [34] The same story is told, with identity of substance and largely of phrase in the *Sulla* and in the *Pompeius*.¹⁰⁶ In the former, however, a fresh detail—Sulla's retirement is connected with the expectation that the undesirable Lepidus would win the consulate: the latter, despite the general plethora of 'incidents' between the old dictator and the young general, ignores the abdication altogether. Material of this kind does not afford a secure basis for chronology, or for anything else.

Not but what Plutarch is accepted and enhanced, and a lively picture is drawn of the electoral campaign of summer, 79 BC—Lepidus erupting virulent invective against the tyranny of Sulla, Pompeius and his soldiers active to intimidate or outvote the freedmen Cornelii. The Senate as a body backed Lepidus, the lesser of two evils, and, on a crafty combination offered Sulla the Cisalpina should their candidate subsequently prove a nuisance; while the dictator stifled his impotent rancour, only to unload it on Pompeius after the victory of the grand coalition.¹⁰⁷

If the construction looks coherent, the material is flimsy and treacherous. Perhaps there was very little in the way of electioneering at the consular *comitia* in 79 BC. [35] The Plutarchian story of the support given by Pompeius to Lepidus contains a peculiar detail that has not been accorded sufficient attention. Pompeius' action was bold and provocative, in the outcome deplorable. Sulla protested. How grave was the transgression? Two candidates are named, and only two, Lepidus and Catulus. Pompeius backs the one, and gets him in first. That is all. He does not shut out the other, the respectable Catulus. Perhaps he could not, he or any other man, because there were only two candidates for the two places. Were there another, a good oligarch, a safe

¹⁰⁶ Plut. *Sull.* 34; *Pomp.* 15.

[17] ¹⁰⁷ J. Carcopino, *Sylla* 200–4; *Histoire romaine* II, 1² (1940), 496: 'Lépidé tout de suite mena une campagne d'une incroyable violence contre le dictateur', etc.

and desirable consul, Pompeius should have been heavily censured for his exclusion.

Sulla was a private citizen, but not devoid of *auctoritas*; and the consuls who presided at the elections, P. Servilius Vatia and Ap. Claudius Pulcher, were sound men, chosen by the dictator. The inauguration of the restored Republic demanded discreet control, an avoidance of deleterious competition for the consulate. Two candidates were allowed to present themselves in 80 BC, under the dictatorship. Strong reasons commended the same procedure in the next year. A [36] parallel is instructive. In January, 27 BC, the master of the Empire regulated his position with regard to the Republic. Liberty and the consulate were synonymous. Yet the procedure adopted at the next elections was surely not sensibly modified. The people chose Augustus, and for colleague, T. Statilius Taurus, second only to Agrippa among the marshals. Were there other candidates?

If the function of the *comitia* in 79 BC as in 80 BC was mainly formal and ceremonial, to determine only the order of preference between Catulus and Lepidus, an important conclusion emerges: Lepidus enjoyed the approbation of Sulla and of the aristocracy. Why not? The head of the *gens Aemilia*, a patrician (and few patricians were available), had a strong family claim.¹⁰⁸ They may have cherished no illusions about his character and integrity; but they did not know that, when Sulla was no more, the consul M. Aemilius Lepidus would try to overthrow Sulla's constitution. If the electoral arrangements of 79 BC were a proper subject of recrimination, then or later, it was not Pompeius that should have been rebuked. Somebody or other might have adverted upon Sulla's predilection for the bluest blood. To conserve the oligarchy, why did he not put up a steady man without pretensions or consular ancestors such as C. Scribonius Curio?¹⁰⁹

[37] The anecdote—Catulus outdistanced but not defeated by Lepidus—implies, though it does not prove, that there were only two candidates. The biographic literature is exceedingly difficult to assess. Plutarch furnishes a mass of information. Some of the personal details about the early life of Pompeius and of Caesar derive from the best of sources, and, though standing alone, are unimpeachable. Thus Caesar's office of curator of the *Via Appia*, or his eating asparagus with a man called Valerius Leo at Mediolanum.¹¹⁰ Nobody doubts Sulla's ultimate matrimonial venture, with a Valeria, despite the picturesque embroidery.¹¹¹ Again there are notices which arrest attention by their very paradox—the possibility that the patrician Claudii might have

¹⁰⁸ Cf. further below [no. 6, 'M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 78 BC)].

¹⁰⁹ Curio, tribune of the plebs as early as 90 BC (Cic. *Brut.* 305), was consul in 76 BC. It appears that he stood down the year before in favour of Mam. Lepidus Livianus. This is deduced from Sall. *Hist.* 1.75 M. [= 75 McG. = 66 R.].

¹¹⁰ Plut. *Caes.* 5; 17.

¹¹¹ Plut. *Sull.* 35.

taken up the *novus homo* Cicero and bound him to their cause by a dynastic marriage with Clodia.¹¹² But Plutarch sometimes retails shocking rubbish. Caesar, captured by the pirates, is made to exclaim ‘how happy Crassus will be!’¹¹³ The context discloses a fantastic misconception—three political parties at Rome in the seventies, their leaders being Caesar, Pompeius, and Crassus. A suspicion cannot be suppressed that Pompeius’ defiance of Sulla, about the triumph and about Lepidus, has been considerably elaborated.¹¹⁴

One of the two versions of the Lepidus’ story even implies that the candidature of Lepidus had something to do with the dictator’s abdication. [38] Critics of sacred or profane narrative hesitate to admit the oracle *ex eventu*. Many of the traditional anecdotes of Roman history belong to this class. Sulla, we know, told the optimates that Caesar was destined to destroy them.¹¹⁵ Not content with this, Suetonius recounts in another place that Sulla urged them to beware of the boy with the loosely girt toga—with reiterated admonition.¹¹⁶ The story gains added point in its latest elaboration: Sulla warns Pompeius against his rival and conqueror.¹¹⁷

The Plutarchian anecdote about Pompeius and Lepidus betrays its falsity: it asserts that Lepidus had no claim or resources of his own, that his success was due to Pompeius’ efforts only and Pompeius’ popularity.¹¹⁸ Worse than this, it avows its prophetic character.¹¹⁹ Lepidus is already a bold bad man, an enemy of Sulla;¹²⁰ and Catulus, his antithesis, is already in possession of that eminent reputation which accorded him, when a senior consular, the primacy in the Roman aristocracy, and the rôle, though not the title, of *princeps senatus*.¹²¹

¹¹² Plut. *Cic.* 29.

¹¹³ Plut. *Crass.* 7.

[18] ¹¹⁴ Apart from the appeal of dramatic value, motive might be suspected—to disculpate Pompeius of subservience to the dictator and show that Caesar was not the only man of spirit. The story about Lepidus’ candidature, while exaggerating Pompeius’ power and influence, does not, however, credit him with foresight—that is Sulla’s rôle. It must again be repeated that Plutarch is the only authority.

¹¹⁵ Suet. *DJ* 1.3 (above, n. 48).

¹¹⁶ Suet. *DJ* 45.5: *unde emanasse Sullae dictum optimates saepius admonentis ut male praecinctum puerum caverent* [‘the warning that Sulla gave to the optimates on many occasions – “beware of the boy with the loose belt” – stems from this’].

¹¹⁷ Macrobian. *Sat.* 2.3.9.

¹¹⁸ Plut. *Sull.* 34.4: *Μάρκος Λέπιδος, οὐ δι’ ἑαυτόν, ἀλλὰ Πομπηίου σπουδάζοντι καὶ δεομένῳ τοῦ δήμου χαριζομένῳ* [‘Marcus Lepidus, was tipped to be elected consul, not because of his own merits, but owing to the favourable response of the people to Pompey’s canvassing on his behalf’]; *Pompeius* 15: *Λέπιδον εἰς ὑπατείαν κατέστησε* [‘he appointed Lepidus to the consulship’].

¹¹⁹ Plut. *Sull.* 34: *ὥσπερ ἀπεθέσπισε* [‘he spoke just like a prophet’]; *Pomp.* 16: *τὰ μαντεύματα* [‘the prophecies’].

[19] ¹²⁰ Plut. *Sull.* 34: *θρασύς ἀνὴρ καὶ πολέμιος* [‘a bold man and an enemy of his’].

¹²¹ Plut. *Pomp.* 15.2 (cf. *Sull.* 34.5): *Κάτλου τοῦ πάντων ἀρίστου Λέπιδον τὸν πάντων κάκιστον ἀποδείχθῃναι πρότερον ὑπατον* [‘Lepidus, the worst of men, was elected consul by a larger vote than Catulus, the best of men’]; cf. Cic. *In Pis.* 6: *princeps huius ordinis* [‘a foremost member of this order’]; Velleius 2.43.4: *omnium confessione senatus princeps* [‘by everybody’s admission the

It is not at all likely that Lepidus stood for the consulate in 79 BC as a declared enemy of Sulla.¹²² Lepidus' villainy and Sulla's prescience, it is all too obvious. These stories are tainted by foreknowledge of the future. [39] Scepticism will be salubrious. Received doctrine holds that Pompeius helped Lepidus to the consulate, incurring thereby the resentment of Sulla. It should have been made clear that the basis for such a belief is highly insecure. Plutarch is the sole guarantor. And, if Plutarch's story is to be admitted at all, despite its highly suspect character, it suggests that Lepidus was a candidate approved by the oligarchy—and that Pompeius' behaviour was not an attack on Sulla or on the new order. It may be added that no ancient authority affirms that Sulla still held the dictatorship when the consuls were elected in the summer of 79 BC.¹²³

It is time to summarise the argument. The grand coalition collapses. The trial of Roscius belongs to the first half of 80 BC. If, as seems most probable, Pompeius celebrated his triumph on 12 March 79 BC,¹²⁴ Sulla was no longer dictator; and Lepidus' candidature conveyed no sign or declaration of his subsequent activities.

Sufficient emphasis has been laid upon the inadequacies of the evidence. A simple solution is [40] not precluded. Sulla was ambitious, but he did not aspire to monarchy. If he is not altogether a typical and predictable *nobilis*, but somewhat *déclassé*, then his return to orthodoxy is all the more savage and sincere. Civil war brought him to supreme power. His rule was despotic because temporary, and he resigned of his own will, when he had regulated the Commonwealth. Not one among the ancient authorities states or implies the contrary. The most austere critic, the bitterest enemy of the oligarchs, cannot but concede that Sulla did his best for them.¹²⁵ If the *nobiles* failed to maintain the system, it was their fault, not his. Caesar's comment can be understood—Sulla believed in the *res publica*. Or at least, he behaved as though he did.

The act of abdication, which ought to have been important as well as dramatic, has left scanty traces in the tradition. Only Appian dwells on it. The precise date is not clearly stated. The omissions and confusions of the

foremost member of the Senate']. J. Vogt's paper on the predecessors of the *optimus princeps* will be noted: 'Vorläufer des optimus princeps', *Hermes* 68 (1933), 84–92, esp. 90–1.

¹²² Such is, however, the general assumption, cf. not only Carcopino (*Sylla*, 199–200), but H. M. Last, 'The Breakdown of the Sullan System and the Rise of Pompey', *CAH IX* (Cambridge 1932) 313–49, at 314: 'as an open enemy of the dictator.'

¹²³ The closest approach is Plut. *Sull.* 34—the expectation that Lepidus would be elected. Carcopino, however, uses this passage to prove that the abdication came soon *after* the consular elections (*Sylla* 208).

¹²⁴ Above, [n. 81].

¹²⁵ Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte* II⁸ (1889), 374. Mommsen found a lack of originality in Sulla's dispositions (*ibid.* 372). For an acute and judicious appraisal of Sulla's skill in combining the old and the new, cf. H. M. Last, *CAH IX*, 280–2.

literary authorities are so flagrant that nobody would care to appeal to their silence. Yet their silence may be comprehensible. Despite Appian and the importunate urchin, the day and the occasion were not highly significant. By his tenure of the consulate in 80 BC [41] the dictator inaugurated the rule of law and prepared the way to glide out gracefully.¹²⁶ His retirement was not unexpected; and, though no longer dictator, he was still a force to be reckoned with.

Sulla's death, not Sulla's abdication, that is the historical date. The interval, twelve or fifteen months, was a tranquil period. But when Sulla's death was announced, Etruria rose in rebellion, and before long all the enemies of Sulla found a champion in the consul Lepidus. The torch was lit at Sulla's pyre.¹²⁷

Sallust knew what he was doing. He neglected the abdication of Sulla; and the year of the consuls Ap. Pulcher and P. Servilius, under the shadow of Sulla, was void of historical moment. Had Sallust suspected that Sulla was deposed by the Metelli, Pompeius, and Lepidus, he might have exploited the situation with telling point—the vanity of ambition, the delusion of power, the incurable folly of the oligarchs. Sallust, however, began with the next consuls, Lepidus and Catulus. But Sallust, choosing this *exordium*, has to anticipate on the order of events: Lepidus must declare war on Sulla and the oligarchy before Sulla is dead.¹²⁸

[42] In Sulla's career and acts a perplexing ambiguity is discovered—ruthless ambition, cynical cruelty, faith only in luck or the absurd, yet at the end loyal service to the Empire of Rome and the rule of the aristocracy. If his actions become intelligible, his character remains an enigma. The ancients proclaimed it—*istud inter res nondum indicatas, qualis Sulla fuerit*.¹²⁹ But the ancients are rudimentary in their judgements: they prefer that men should be all of a piece, good or bad, duly embodying the categories that had been ordained by philosophers.¹³⁰ The discords are real, just as the age was chaotic. Sulla was as Roman *nobilis*, but also, as general of the imperial Republic, a kind of Hellenistic dynast. That the discords should stand on record shows the tradition to be in the main trustworthy. Nothing can convert Sulla into a type or model. He is more than that. He is authentic.¹³¹

[20] ¹²⁶ Cf. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte* II⁸ (1889), 360–1.

¹²⁷ Flor. 2.11.1.

¹²⁸ See further below ['M. Aemilius Lepidus (*cos.* 78 BC)].

¹²⁹ Sen. *Cons. Marc.* 12.6 ['What sort of man Sulla was must be numbered among the questions still undecided']. Cf. the developments of Carcopino, *Sylla* 9–18.

¹³⁰ Cf. in general the observations of Wilamowitz: 'sie haben doch alle nicht begriffen, einmal dass der Mensch erst mit seinem Widerspruch ein vollständiger Mensch ist, zweitens dass man ihn als Werden den begreifen muss', *Hellenistische Dichtung* I (Berlin 1924) 75.

¹³¹ Mommsen's brilliant characterisation will still be read with profit as well as enjoyment. Berve lays strong emphasis on the Roman and the traditional ('Sulla', *Neue Jahrbücher* 7 [1931], 673–82, at 673). The exposition of Last (*CAH* IX, 280–312, esp. 309–12), more about the work than the man, as is fitting, has an air of finality. It is unfortunately not referred to at all in the second edition of Carcopino's *Histoire romaine* II, 1 (1940), which notices Berve's paper—and the book of Carolina Lanzani.

The Speech for Roscius of Ameria

[1] The orations in defence of Quinctius and of Roscius are not only the earliest speeches in the Ciceronian corpus: they provide the sole contemporary witness to conditions under the dictatorship of Sulla. According to Aulus Gellius, the speeches were delivered in consecutive years, 81 and 80 BC.¹ These dates have recently been challenged. Gellius' calculation, it is argued, is erroneous. He gives the years by consuls, but these are not the primary facts—he merely deduced them from Cicero's age at the time of the speech *Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*.² Cicero was born on January 3, 106 BC. When defending Roscius, so Gellius says, he was twenty-seven years old. Therefore the speech must belong to 79 BC, not to 80 BC.

Appeal is made to the context of these statements. It fails to produce the result postulated. On the contrary, Gellius arrives at Cicero's age through the consular dates. This is his exposition. If you add up the years from Q. Caepio and A. Serranus (when Cicero was born) to M. Tullius and Cn. Dolabella (when he delivered the *Pro Quinctio*), the [2] sum comes to twenty-six. Further, there is no doubt that Cicero defended Roscius the year after, when aged twenty-seven, under the consulate of L. Sulla Felix II and Q. Metellus Pius.³

The source and manner of Gellius' computation is evident. From 106 BC to 81 BC, Cicero's birth to his *Pro Quinctio*, he reckons twenty-six years. He follows the common practice of the ancients in their measurements of time—inclusive reckoning, from the first unit in the series to the last. Thus 81 BC is twenty-six years after 106 BC, 80 BC, twenty-seven; and Cicero defends Roscius *annos iam septem atque viginti natus* ['twenty-seven years old'].

Gellius has adopted as basis for his calculation the consular dates, only he has been careless. The year from 106 BC to 80 BC add up to twenty-seven, but that does not mean that Cicero completed the twenty-seventh year of his

[1] ¹ Gell. NA 15.28.3.

² J. Carcopino, *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée* (Paris 1931), 156, and, more fully, CRAI 1931, 361–3, where it is stated that 'si l'on se reporte au contexte, l'on s'aperçoit que les dates consulaires ont été inférées par Aulu-Gelle, avec une erreur de calcul, des nombres d'années qu'il donne à Cicéron lors des deux plaidoyers' (361).

³ Gell. NA 15.28.3.

life in 80 BC, as Gellius assumes and states. He was not twenty-seven until January 3, 79 BC.

Cicero was twenty-six at the time of the *Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*. Gellius himself confirms it a little later in the same chapter. Comparing Demosthenes and Cicero at the outset of their oratorical [3] careers, he affirms that Cicero defended Roscius in his twenty-seventh year.⁴ From which follows a fact of some interest. To Gellius it was all one—*septimo et vicesimo anno* or *septem ac viginti annos natus*. Internal evidence decides the question. The testimony of Quintilian—Cicero was twenty-six—is welcome but not indispensable.⁵

Apart from gross ignorance or deliberate fraud (both operative in the case of Pompeius Magnus) estimates of age, even where the birthday happens to be attested, are liable to uncertainty in the computation. Modern writers are likewise not always sufficiently vigilant in such estimates of a man's age at a certain point in his career.⁶ Gellius' remarks about the *Rosciana* illustrate two hazards—inclusive reckoning and the identification of cardinal and ordinal numbers. They have affected not a few dates in Latin literary history. Jerome puts Catullus' birth in 87 BC, his death in 58 BC, in the thirtieth year of his age.⁷ The one date is certainly wrong, and it is therefore illegitimate to retain the other. Jerome probably took the figure *tricesimo anno* from Suetonius and misapplied it: in Suetonius it signified 'aged thirty' not 'in his thirtieth year'.⁸ Thirty is a convenient round number: it may be right (?82–52 BC), or it may not. [4] When the date of Catullus' birth became a subject of learned enquiry, could it still be ascertained? Similarly, Cornelius Gallus. Jerome states that he died in 27 BC in the forty-third year of his age.⁹ To infer that the poet was born in 69 BC is a spurious precision.¹⁰ Gallus' age was set down as forty-three—which figure surely derives from an attractive and conversant synchronism with the Virgilian year, 70 BC.¹¹

In the chapter of the *Noctes Atticae* here under review, Gellius displays uncommon erudition. Not only Cicero's birthday and the citation of consular dates for the *Pro Quinctio* and the *Pro Roscio*. Cornelius Nepos comes in for criticism. Though a good scholar, *rerum memoriae non indiligens* ['diligent about the recording of events'], and a friend of Cicero, he went badly astray,

⁴ *Ibid.* [15.28.6]: *alter κατὰ Ἀνδροτιόνος et κατὰ Τιμοκράτους septem et viginti annos natus, alter anno minor pro P. Quinctio septimoque et vicesimo pro Sex. Roscio* ['One gave Against Androton and Against Timocrates at twenty-seven; the other gave In defence of Publius Quinctius when he was a year younger, and In defence of Sextus Roscius at twenty-seven'].

⁵ Quint. 12.6.4: *sex et viginti natus annos*.

⁶ For example, Ti. Claudius Nero, born in 42 BC, was consul in 13 BC; but it is incorrect to say that he 'became consul at the age of twenty-nine' (as in *RR* 418).

⁷ Jerome p. 150 Helm (87 BC); 154 H (58 BC): *Catullus tricesimo aetatis anno Romae moritur*.

⁸ Cf. the arguments of B. Schmidt, 'Die Lebenszeit Catullus und die Herausgabe seiner Gedichte', *RhM* 69 (1914), 267–83.

⁹ Jerome p. 164 H.

¹⁰ As Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* II⁴ (Munich 1935) 169.

¹¹ As suggested in 'The Origin of Cornelius Gallus', *CQ* 32 (1938), 40 [= *RP* 1.48–9].

alleging that the orator was twenty-three at the time of the *Pro Roscio*.¹² Further, Fenestella is taken to task: he said that Cicero was in his twenty-sixth year.¹³

Fenestella might be justified: he followed the practice of other writers, as shown above, equating cardinal and ordinal numbers. But there is no need to vindicate Fenestella, a meritorious Augustan antiquary and historian with a flair for authentic detail [5]—he had even interviewed the girl who alleviated the sojourn of M. Crassus, a refugee in a cave in Spain when the enemies of the optimates were lords of Rome¹⁴—still less a second-hand polymath of the Antonine age. Gellius' erudition is not a domestic product, fortunately. The truth slips out. Gellius discloses the fact that Asconius Pedianus adverted upon the error of Fenestella.¹⁵ All is bright and clear. Asconius is the source of Gellius' observations. Therefore Asconius guarantees the date of the *Pro Roscio*—not a mere inference from Cicero's age, known or supposed, but historical research of a high order. To insist upon the candour and learning of that remarkable man would be a supererogation, offensive to the memory of Asconius and the dignity of scholarship.

The date of the *Rosciana* is not merely an item in literary chronology or a curiosity of antiquarian investigation. It belongs to the structure of history. The 'revised' date, 79 BC instead of 80 BC, has ceased to be a novelty on [5a] the market, commanded by a single book or a single author. It has been taken up without suspicion, not only where the author's general thesis is enthusiastically acclaimed, but even among those who are not impressed by all the paraphernalia of the monarchic Sulla or convinced by the grand coalition that thwarted his designs, the Metelli, Lepidus, and Pompeius. It is now a dogma and an axiom.¹⁶

Consultation of the text of Aulus Gellius should have engendered dubitation. It does not prove what it is alleged to prove. If Gellius is unsatisfactory in his computation of Cicero's age, his procedure is clear and intelligible. He argues from the date of the *Rosciana*, the consulate of Sulla and Metellus Pius. He uses Asconius, the best of authorities, annexing Asconius' criticisms of other scholars. [6] If any persist in the novel belief that the *Pro Quinctio* belongs to 80 BC, the *Pro Roscio* to 79, they have an unenviable task, the onus of proving Asconius wrong.

¹² Gell. NA 15.28.4–5.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Plut. *Crass.* 5.

[3]¹⁵ Gell. NA 15.28.4.

¹⁶ Thus it was accepted even by the elegantly sceptical reviewer [M. I. Munro] in *JRS* 22 (1932), 240. Likewise A. Passerini, when criticising Carcopino's conception of the luck of Sulla, *Philologus* 90 (1935), 94: 'tengo per definitiva la ricostruzione'. Further the reviewer [W. Seston] of C. Lanzani, *Lucio Cornelio Silla Dittatore* (Milan 1936) in *REA* 40 (1938), 340, assumes 79 BC as axiomatic for the *Rosciana*. It is unfortunate that no attention has been paid to Gelzer's brief statement about the proper interpretation of Gellius (*Gnomon* 8 [1932], 607). The truth is patent; and Gelzer refuses even to notice the 'revised date' in his monograph on Cicero (*RE* VII A, 835–[8]).

This being so, it might seem superfluous to assess various subsidiary arguments that were adduced in support of that modified dating which Gellius was hastily assumed to justify. Yet, if grave misconceptions are prevalent, it is right that they should be exposed and condemned in company. First, the *Pro Quinctio*. A passage, referring to events in the year 83 BC, assigns to C. Valerius Flaccus (*cos.* 93 BC), the title *imperator*.¹⁷ But, it is argued, Flaccus probably did not triumph until 80 BC, therefore the speech cannot have been delivered before that year.¹⁸ The presupposition apparently is that a general did not receive the imperial title until he had celebrated a triumph. This is as near the reverse of the truth as might be. The army after a victory acclaimed its general as *imperator*. He might retain that title until his *imperium* lapsed, whether his return to civil life was embellished by a triumph or not. The procedure of Cicero after his Cilician proconsulate furnishes evidence at once familiar and slightly ludicrous. C. Valerius Flaccus, proconsul of Gallia Transalpina under the Marian faction, won or claimed a victory, as his coins struck in Gaul attest;¹⁹ he passed discreetly over to the [7] victorious cause and was allowed by Sulla to hold a triumph. The year is uncertain, probably 81 BC—the only evidence comes from Granius Licinianus.²⁰ In any event, the date of Valerius' imperial acclamation and of his triumph are alike irrelevant to the *Pro Quinctio*: the term *imperator* was also in general use to designate an army commander.²¹

The internal evidence of the speech precludes a date as late as 80 BC. Quinctius left Rome on January 30, 83 BC;²² the actions of his adversaries Naevius and Alfenus induced him to take refuge with C. Flaccus in Gaul.²³ Alfenus started proceedings against him. A summons was issued for September 13. Quinctius duly returned to Rome.²⁴ But Alfenus did nothing for a year and a half. Only after that interval did he approach the praetor Cn. Dolabella.²⁵ Cicero twice complains that the case has been pending for a *biennium*.²⁶ Were he speaking in 80 BC, he could have called it a *triennium*. Further, there is no

[4] ¹⁷ Cic. *Quinct.* 28: *confugit ad C. Flaccum imperatorem qui tunc erat in provincia: quem, ut ipsius dignitas poscit, honoris gratia nomino* ['he fled to C. Flaccus, *imperator*, who was then in the province; I mention him out of respect, as is appropriate to his rank'].

¹⁸ Carcopino, *CRAI* 1931, 362; *Sylla* (1931), 156: 'en 80, alors que le C. Flaccus que ce discours désigne du titre d'*imperator* (VII, 28), avait déjà célébré son triomphe.'

¹⁹ *BMCR* 2.388–90, nos. 1–26 [= Sydenham, *RRC* 120, no. 747 = Crawford, *RRC* 1.379–81, no. 365]. Cf. the title applied to Murena on an almost contemporary inscription (*SIG* ³ 745 = *ILS* 8768: Rhodes): Λεύκιον Λικίνιον Λευκίου υἱὸν Μουρή[αν] ἱμπεράτορα ['L. Licinius Murena, son of Lucius, *imperator*'].

²⁰ Granius p. 31.3–32.1 Flemisch: *et Murena ex Asia triumphavit et Valerius Flaccus ex Celtiberia et Gallia*. Carcopino puts the triumph in 80 BC (*Sylla*, 156), Jullian's date (*Histoire de la Gaule* III, Paris 1908, 102); Gagé, however, following Pais (*Fasti triumphales populi Romani*, I, Rome 1920, 231) says 83 or 82 at the latest (*RH* 171 [1933], 35–6), which is not justifiable.

[5] ²¹ Cf. M. A. Levi, 'L'appellativo *Imperator*', *RFIC* 60 (1932), 207–18.

²² Cic. *Quinct.* 24.

²³ *Ibid.* 28.

²⁴ *Ibid.* 29.

²⁵ *Ibid.* 30.

²⁶ *Ibid.* 42, cf. 67.

reason for transferring the praetorship of Cn. Dolabella (not to be confused with the consul of the same year) from 81 to 80 BC.²⁷

[8] Nor does the *Rosciana* encourage the attempt to alter its date. The case was heard before the praetor M. Fannius.²⁸ This man had previously been aedile, perhaps in 82 BC: if so, the two-year interval between offices being obligatory, could not, it is suggested, have become praetor before 79 BC.²⁹ The fabric is wholly insecure. Fannius was plebeian aedile, therefore an annual interval was permissible. Fannius was aedile with L. Critonius for colleague, therefore certainly not in 82 BC, when M. Pomponius is attested as an *aedilis plebis*.³⁰

A last and fragile contention may be briefly disposed of. Cicero in the speech names a Q. Metellus, who cannot be Pius, the consul of 80 BC, but who is not explicitly differentiated from him.³¹ It follows that no confusion was possible—Pius was not at Rome but had already gone to Spain.³² Pius departed at the beginning of 79 BC. Hence the *Rosciana* cannot belong to 80 BC. Yet it should seem that, as the *nobiles* present in court to support the advocate of Roscius were all young men (see [below, p. 84, 87]), the Metellus there apostrophised, if he was a Quintus Metellus (which is not quite certain), did not have to be distinguished from the eminent consul, [9] wherever Pius might happen to be. Cicero was not annotating for posterity.

On the other hand, were Asconius' authority not thought good enough, the speech contains an indication that might tell for 80 BC against 79. It mentions the legal termination fixed for the proscriptions, *Kalendas Iunias*.³³ This is clearly June 1, 81 BC. The year is not specified. This suggests that the *Rosciana* was delivered in 80 BC, before June of that year. The argument is admissible, though perhaps not wholly conclusive. The term of the proscriptions was so important a date that even the most obtuse and somnolent of jurymen was hardly likely to confuse one first of June with the next, even if twenty months had elapsed and the trial took place early in 79 BC.

The date of the trial of Roscius is clear enough—80 BC, perhaps the earlier months of this year. It was the first case heard before the *quaestio inter sicarios* since Sulla's reorganisation of the law courts.³⁴

[10] Sextus Roscius, a wealthy landowner of Ameria, was assassinated at Rome one evening after supper (about September, 81 BC). To secure impunity, the authors of the crime approached Chrysogonus, a powerful freedman of

²⁷ Cn. Cornelius Dolabella (*pr.* 81 BC) governed Cilicia before P. Servilius Vatia (*cos.* 79 B.C.).

²⁸ *Rosc. Am.* 11. ²⁹ Carcopino, *CRAI* 1931, 362; *Sylla* 156.

³⁰ For the aedileship of Fannius and Critonius see *BMCRR* 1.314[–15, nos. 2463–66 = Sydenham, *RRC* 112 no. 717 = Crawford, *RRC* 1.367, no. 351], where a date c.86 BC is suggested [85 BC in Sydenham, 86 in Crawford]. Münzer, *RE* [IV, 1724, no. 53 and VI, 1993, no. 15]. Pomponius in 82 BC is attested by Plin. *Nat.* 7.158.

³¹ *Cic. Rosc. Am.* 77.

³² Carcopino, *CRAI* 1931, 162.

³³ *Cic. Rosc. Am.* 128. [6] ³⁴ *Ibid.* 11.

Sulla, with an offer to share the spoils—thirteen rich farms. The name of the murdered man was placed on the lists, though several months had elapsed since the legal term of the proscriptions, and his estates were only sold at auction for a derisory sum to the right people. The son of Roscius, a person of dull wits and deficient obtainments, was not exactly an ornament to municipal society. His parent, a local magnate of some pretensions, *homo tam splendidus et graciosus*, more or less relegated him to a grubby existence in the country.³⁵ The rustic seemed an easy victim. The conspirators tried to cover up their tracks by having him prosecuted for the murder of his father.

Cicero undertook to speak for the defence. A bold action, against Chrysogonus, the favourite of Sulla. Cicero lacked the confidence of birth and station. Extreme caution had been needed to carry him safely through the years of civil strife. He had ties with the defeated cause. Arpinum was the home of Marius—and M. Marius Gratidianus, a prominent [11] member of the party, was a first cousin of Cicero's father.³⁶

The subsequent career of Cicero never reveals him as a conscious advocate of hazardous causes. Perhaps the defence of Roscius was not so provocative after all. Chrysogonus and his associates could not find a lawyer of any reputation, social or forensic. The prosecutor, a fellow called Erucius, seems little better than a common informer.³⁷ Cicero conducts the case in fine style, with strong and brilliant eloquence, with subtle and deadly precision. But Cicero did not stand alone. He was supported by many persons of rank, and consequence, impressive though silent;³⁸ and two young *nobiles*, a Scipio and a Metellus, appear to have spoken at an earlier stage of the proceedings.³⁹

The parent Roscius was the first man for wealth, birth, and repute not only at Ameria but in the whole neighbourhood, far and wide; like many municipal grandees, he had patrons at the capital; he had assiduously cultivated the favour of certain noble houses, Scipiones, Metelli, and Servilii. At all times a partisan of the aristocracy, *nobilitatis fautor*, he threw all his weight on the right side in the recent disturbances, deeming it his duty [11a] to fight in defence of that rank and dignity which guaranteed his own. When the *nobiles* came back, Roscius was much at Rome, not from any apprehension but joyous and exultant in public places, celebrating the victory.⁴⁰

The son, though a person of rudimentary intelligence, knew the value of *clientela*. In his hour of need he sought refuge in the house of Caecilia Metella, a great lady.⁴¹ Her descent is certain, daughter of Balaricus (*cos.* 123 BC) and

³⁵ Roscius the father, *ibid.* 15[–17, 20]; the son, 39[–45].

³⁶ For the details, cf. Münzer, *RE* [XIV, 1825–7, no. 42].

³⁷ *Rosc. Am.* [35, 82]. ³⁸ *Ibid.* 1–2.

³⁹ *Ibid.* 77: *te nunc appello P. Scipio, te, Metelle: vobis advocatis, vobis agentibus aliquotiens duos servos paternos in quaestionem ab adversariis Sex. Roscius postulavit.* ['I now appeal to you, P. Scipio, and to you, Metellus: when you took up the defence of Sex. Roscius and were acting as his counsels, he asked his opponents a number of times to be allowed to question in court two slaves of his father.']

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 15–16.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* 27.

therefore sister to Nepos (*cos.* 98 BC),⁴² but not her precise identity. Now Ap. Claudius Pulcher, the consul of 79 BC, took to wife a sister of Nepos: this is proved by the fact that his children were cousins of the two Metelli (the consuls of 60 and 57 BC), the sons of Nepos (*cos.* 98 BC).⁴³ Failing other evidence, the lady who protected Roscius might well be identified as the wife of Ap. Claudius Pulcher.⁴⁴ The speech for Roscius says nothing, it is true, of her husband or children—and Pulcher's wife had no fewer than six children. Perhaps therefore the Caecilia of the *Rosciana* was not Pulcher's wife, but a sister, otherwise unattested.⁴⁵ Certitude [11b] cannot be attained, and Cicero's failure to mention the husband or the children of Caecilia Metella is not conclusive: it does not prove that she had none. Her identity was manifest to the audience. That the advocate should not proclaim or even indicate who her husband was is quite intelligible. It was a political case, but, as Cicero states in his *exordium*, the elder *nobiles* had good reasons for eschewing prominence.⁴⁶ Ap. Claudius Pulcher, who had been praetor in 89 BC, was certain to be consul in the near future, even if he had not by now been designated for the next year.

Caecilia Metella was [12] not merely a woman of courage and character—Cicero goes so far as to praise her *virtus*, a masculine quality.⁴⁷ Superior sanctity attached to the person of Caecilia, and the memory of the *Bellum Italicum* ten years before. When all was disaster and portents, Caecilia revealed a way of salvation. Asking audience of the Senate, she told how Juno Sospita had given counsel in a dream: the goddess complained that her shrine had been desecrated, but would not deny her aid to Rome after proper ceremonies of expiation.⁴⁸

[12a] Caecilia Metella, her family and their allies took up the challenge. There was no choice. One of the most sacred of all *officia* was at stake. If the *nobiles* refused to protect a client, they signed away their honour and forfeited the moral basis of their political ascendancy. Some of the families that came back with Sulla thought only of pride and power, revenge and money. The Metelli were wiser—at least the head of the family. Cicero records an incident that he himself had witnessed, in this very year. The consul Pius intervened at the praetorian elections and begged the Roman people to elect Q. Calpidius. This man was not a client. Pius asserted the precise opposite, that Calpidius by his meritorious action nineteen years before when he proposed a bill for the recall of Numidicus had actually become the

⁴² *Ibid.* 147.

⁴³ *Cic. Dom.* 7; *Har. resp.* 45; *Cael.* 60.

⁴⁴ So Münzer, *RE* III, 1235.

⁴⁵ Carcopino, *Sylla* 180.

[7] ⁴⁶ *Cic. Rosc. Am.* 1–2.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* 27.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 27: *quasi exempli causa vestigia antiqui officii remanent*; *Div.* 1.4; 2.94; *Obsequens* 55.

patronus of the Metelli.⁴⁹ *Pietas* could not go further than this, in justifying a *cognomen*.⁵⁰

If the *nobiles* put honour above all things, Sulla could not complain. Their duty was manifest, but they preferred to insist in an inoffensive and invulnerable fashion—not the leading men, but Caecilia Metella and aristocratic youth—so as to preclude the scandal of an open break with their formidable protector.

[13] They turned up in force at the trial of Roscius. Rising to speak, Cicero at once explains why so many men of distinction and eloquence are present yet constrained to silence. They know their duty, but fear the *iniquitas temporum*. Such was their dignity and authority—that, if any of them touched on politics, as he needs must in this case, his utterances would be accorded an importance out of all proportion.⁵¹

Three aristocratic names emerge in the course of the speech. The most illustrious is that of P. Scipio.⁵² Is he P. Scipio Nasica, the praetor of 94 BC, whose father (*cos.* 111 BC) had married a Metella?⁵³ It is not very likely. The line was unlucky—the parent died in Africa, and the son never reached the consulate. Nasica is not heard of after his praetorship and command in Spain. A man of his pedigree should have been consul in 91, 90, or 89 BC: birth was reinforced by military experience. Defeat at the polls or prosecution and banishment might be expected to leave some trace in the tradition. P. Scipio Nasica finds no record earlier on the consular *Fasti* or among the army commanders in the *Bellum Italicum*. It may with fair degree of safety be inferred that he was no longer alive in the year of the *Pro Roscio*: he had probably been dead for ten years or more.⁵⁴ P. Scipio must be Nasica's son, at this time a youth of about sixteen, who was later to pass into the family of his grandmother, being adopted by Metellus Pius, and become known as Q. Metellus Scipio (*cos.* 52 BC).

[14] In the same sentence with P. Scipio the orator appeals to a Metellus—*te nunc appello, P. Scipio, te Metelle*.⁵⁵ Propriety suggests that he too be furnished

⁴⁹ Cic. *Planc.* 69: *Q. Metellum Pium consulem praetoriis comitiis, petente Q. Calidio, populo Romano supplicasse, cum quidem non dubitaret et consul et homo nobilissimus patronum esse illum suum et familiae suae nobilissimae dicere* ['the consul Q. Metellus Pius at the elections for the praetorship, when Q. Calidius was standing for office, begged the Roman people, and did not hesitate to say that he was his patron and the patron of his most noble family, even though he was a consul and a man of the highest standing'].

⁵⁰ [RE III, 1, 1354, no. 5.]

⁵¹ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 1–2.

⁵² *Ibid.* 77.

⁵³ So Münzer, *RE* IV, 351, but afterward opted for the son, *RA* 309–10. The praetorship of P. Nasica is generally put in 93 BC, so Münzer (followed in *RR*, Table I). But [8] Obs. 51 puts his operations in Spain under 94 BC. Governors of the two Spanish provinces, Didius and P. Crassus, triumphed in June, 93 BC (*CIL* I², p. 49). This does not preclude the hypothesis that P. Nasica was already in Spain before the end of 94 BC.

⁵⁴ Carcopino repeats P. Nasica—but only on grounds of age (*Sylla* 165).

⁵⁵ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 77.

with a *praenomen*. The simplest solution would be *M(arce)*, giving M. Metellus, praetor in 69 BC.⁵⁶ One manuscript, however, though not among the best, has *Q(uinte)*.⁵⁷ If this be accepted, an embarrassing plethora surges up. Q. Metellus Nepos (*cos.* 98 BC) was dead, and so perhaps was Q. Celer (*tr.pl.* 90 BC), who adopted the elder son of Nepos.⁵⁸ There remain Q. Creticus (*cos.* 69 BC) and the two sons of Nepos, with identical *praenomina*, namely Q. Celer (*cos.* 60 BC) and Q. Nepos (*cos.* 57 BC), the *duo Metelli* who not many months later were to prosecute M. Lepidus the proconsul of Sicily.⁵⁹ If the Metellus in question was in fact a Quintus, the principle of preferring youth (which will be justified below) turns the choice towards one of the *duo Metelli*. Which of them, who can say? And if one of them was present in court, was not his brother also?

[15] The third *nobilis* is M. Messalla.⁶⁰ The choice lies between the consuls of 61 and 53 BC, Niger and Rufus. It is easily made. Cicero commends Messalla for having taken in hand all the public and official arrangements for the defence of Roscius while Caecilia Metella worked in private: youth and modesty alone had deterred him from speaking. The excuse, hardly valid for Niger, who was only two years younger than Cicero, would be more than ample for Rufus—ten years on a computation from the date of his consulate.⁶¹ Indeed, it suggests an alarming precocity. But this man, M. Valerius (M.' f.) Messalla Rufus, was not a rapid performer in the later stages of his career. Consul in 53 BC, he had been praetor in 61 BC,⁶² the year of his cousin's consulate. He was therefore about five years junior to Cicero.

The prominence of a noble matron and a noble youth in a suit that was nominally private but in fact political is highly significant. Expedience forbade the participation of men in the first rank of public dignity such as Metella's husband, Ap. Claudius Pulcher, or P. Servilius Vatia, whose imminent consulate might be surmised though it was probably not yet known. Cicero in his exordium refers to the presence in court of *nobiles* who have precedence before him in years as well as in talent and authority. [16] No members of this class seem to be named, but only his juniors. The important rôle assumed by M. Messalla may perhaps be taken for guidance. Messalla was about twenty-one. The unidentified Metellus, if he be either Celer or Nepos, belongs

⁵⁶ So Münzer, *RE* III, no. 78, 1206; Gelzer, *RE* VII A, 837.

⁵⁷ Cf. Carcopino, *Sylla* 165.

⁵⁸ Q. Celer, *tr.pl.* 90 BC, cf. Cic. *Brut.* 305. He is otherwise known only from Plut. *Cor.* 11, and perhaps Val. Max. 6.1.8.

⁵⁹ Pseudo-Asconius 206 Orelli = p. 259.1–3 Stangl.

⁶⁰ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 149: *fori indicique rationem M. Messalla, ut videtis, suscepit: qui si iam satis aetatis ac roboris haberet, ipse pro Sex. Roscio diceret* ['as you can see, M. Messalla has taken up the management of what takes place in the forum and in the court. And if he were of a suitable age and strength, he would speak himself for Sextus Roscius'].

⁶¹ So Carcopino, *Sylla* 162.

[9] ⁶² Cic. *Sull.* 42.

to the same age group. Had P. Scipio Nasica (*pr.* 94 BC) been still alive, it would have been peculiarly incongruous to mention him in such company. His son, consul in 52 BC, might seem a little young. But his unmatched ancestry put him ahead of any Metellus in his own generation;⁶³ and, on the other hand, despite that pedigree, his expectation of the consulate may have been frustrated for a year or two under the rule of the three dynasts until Pompeius Magnus took him up, married his daughter, and rescued him from prosecution.

The defence of Roscius looks like a concerted rally of the younger *nobiles*, their elders prudently eschewing publicity.⁶⁴ Only three of the young men happen to be named. The Servilii were also among the patrons of Roscius' family; but the son of P. Servilius Vatia had perhaps not yet put on the *toga virilis*. Ap. Claudius Pulcher (*cos.* 54 BC), who was available, may not have been impressed by the municipal upstart whom his mother and her friends enlisted on the side of aristocratic *virtus* and *fides*, creating thereby the occasion for an oratorical triumph: he was later to display a singular apathy on the subject of Cicero. Older men were present. [16a] Q. Hortensius had been counsel for the prosecution the year before when Cicero spoke for P. Quintius.⁶⁵ His eminence as an orator went back to a striking début in 95 BC, and he now had few rivals. Hortensius was eight years older than Cicero. It would be a tempting speculation, what he thought of the *Rosciana*.

Hortensius claims relevance through his family relationships. As his sister had married a Messalla, he was the uncle of the young Messalla active on behalf of Roscius.⁶⁶ Hortensius many years later undertook the defence of his nephew, in 51 BC.⁶⁷ Of the two branches of the patrician Valerii now surviving, the Flacci had been prominent with three recent consulates (100, 93, and 86 BC)—and compromised. L. Flaccus, the *princeps senatus*, and his cousin C. Flaccus passed over to Sulla in time, but the family secured no more consulates and soon became extinct. The Messallae exhibit a striking contrast—no consul since 161 BC.

The line regains distinction in Sulla's oligarchy. Niger and Rufus (61 and 53 BC) restore the name to the *Fasti*, it is perpetuated under Caesar Augustus but does not outlive the dynasty of Julii and Claudii. In the gap of two generations, after 161 BC, only two Valerii Messallae find notice—one prosecuted by Metellus Numidicus, the other legate in the *Bellum Italicum*.⁶⁸

[16b] The Valerii are not named by Cicero among the families in whose *clientela* was Roscius of Ameria. His champions in the first instance are the

⁶³ Cf. the full exposition of his pedigree in Cic. *Brut.* 212–13.

⁶⁴ Cf. Carcopino, *Sylla* 166. ⁶⁵ *Quinct.* 1.

⁶⁶ Val. Max. 5.9.2. ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*; Cic. *Fam.* 8.2.1, 4.1.

⁶⁸ Gell. *NA* 15.4.1; App. *BC* 1.40. It is not clear where these two men belong on the stemma, cf. Münzer, *De gente Valeria* (Diss. Berlin 1891) 52. Niger (*cos.* 61 BC) was 'M. f., M.' n. (*ILS* 46), Rufus probably M.' f. It may be presumed that they were cousins, their grandfather being an otherwise unattested M.' Valerius Messalla, son of the consul of 161 BC.

Metelli. But young Messalla also turns out to be very active. No tie of kinship is known, now or later; and the Valerii Messallae had languished in obscurity during the predominance of the Metelli—there might even be a feud, dating back to a prosecution in that period.

This is remarkable. There is more. Sulla's fifth and last wife was a Valeria. Plutarch says that she was the sister of Hortensius—that is to say, half-sister.⁶⁹ On this showing it could be argued that Hortensius' mother had married twice, that M. Messalla Rufus⁷⁰ (*cos.* 53 BC) was a uterine brother of Q. Hortensius (*cos.* 69 BC). But Plutarch is wrong. Rufus was Hortensius' nephew;⁷¹ the father of Rufus had married Hortensius' sister. Valeria therefore was either the sister-in-law or the niece of Hortensius. Some favour the former alternative, on arguments of age, here inconclusive.⁷² The latter is perhaps preferable. Anyhow, it matters little. The choice concerns genealogical tables rather than political history. Sulla's Valeria was either the aunt or the sister of the young man who made himself so conspicuous at the trial of Roscius. [17] The only evidence comes from a Plutarchian anecdote. Sulla celebrated his victory with lavish games and shows in the autumn of 81 BC.⁷³ During the festivities his wife Caecilia Metella fell ill and died. Only a few months later Sulla happened to be present at a show of gladiators. Seated not far away was a gay young lady, recently divorced, Valeria by name. She stole up behind him, filched some threads of his toga and returned to her place: she wanted a piece of his luck, tangible and potent. Sulla made enquiry about her identity and circumstances. Smiles were exchanged and glances of complicity. Wedlock ensued.

[18] The date of Sulla's marriage to Valeria might be put after his abdication. All that there is to go on is Plutarch's statement—the idyllic scene at the gladiatorial show occurred a few months after the death of Caecilia Metella. There is no guarantee that the biographer has not compressed the interval between Sulla's bereavement and Sulla's remarriage.⁷⁴ Yet Sulla was not the man to remain long in celibacy: there is a chance, and the chance must be admitted, that the match had been already arranged or consummated when Valeria's brother was overtly acting on behalf of Roscius, in concert with Caecilia Metella.

It is time to assess briefly the political bearing of the trial. It was employed by the aristocracy as a manifestation of their sentiments. Did it shake or break

⁶⁹ Plut. *Sull.* 35: Μεσσάλα γὰρ ἦν θυγάτηρ, Ὀρτησίου δὲ τοῦ ῥήτορος ἀδελφή, Οὐαλλερία δὲ τοῦνομα.

⁷⁰ So Carcopino, *Sylla* 217: 'certinement la soeur utérine du grand orateur Hortensius'.

⁷¹ Val. Max. 5.9.2. [10] ⁷² For example Münzer, *De gente Valeria* 52.

⁷³ Plut. *Sull.* 35: for the date, *CIL* 1², p. 333.

⁷⁴ Carcopino dates the marriage after Sulla's abdication, that is, on his showing late summer, 79 BC, *Sylla* 218: yet the 'idyll' is supposed to begin in the spring of the previous year (*ibid.*). This tardiness does not well accord with what is known of Sulla's character and habits.

Sulla, that is the question? The champions of Roscius had an impeccable case. The murdered man was not merely politically innocuous, but an adherent of the victorious party; the confiscation and sale of his property was illegal; and the incriminated son was patently not among the beneficiaries of the crime. Defending Roscius, the aristocracy asserted their honour and dignity, Sulla's cause and theirs. If they fought for that, it was right for young Messalla to fight for Roscius.⁷⁵ The appeal was rational—against cruelty, because the proscriptions were over; for ordered government, because Sulla was restoring the *res publica*.

Cicero's oration studiously dissociates Sulla from Chrysogonus: those who hold the regiment of earth or heaven may be omnipotent, but they cannot be omniscient.⁷⁶ Leaders who rise to power through civil war collect strange associates. Suetonius comments on Augustus' loyalty to his friends, his tolerance of their vices, the less flagrant, at least, he adds.⁷⁷ Of catastrophes he can name only those of Salvidienus and of Cornelius Gallus. Other allies of the Princeps enjoyed wealth and power to the end of their days. Suetonius does not mention the unspeakable Vedius Pollio, a freedman's son, or of freedman stock. If Augustus' displeasure was shown during Vedius' lifetime, by a scene at a banquet, it did not involve the disgrace of the favourite. The renouncement of *amicitia* was posthumous, when Augustus converted to public use some, but not all, of the advantageous properties bequeathed to him by the will of Vedius Pollio.⁷⁸

From first to last Sulla showed a predilection for low life or mixed society. The legacies of the woman Nicopolis repaired his youthful indigence;⁷⁹ the company of dramatic artists solaced the retirement of the elder statesman.⁸⁰ [20] But Sulla was capricious and incalculable, like the divinity he adored. Even a young *nobilis* felt the weight of his displeasure, Crassus, whose rapacity in the proscriptions went beyond the limits.⁸¹ The favourite Chrysogonus may have presumed too much; if the season was ripe for him to be chastened, let others do it. The assumption that an attack on the illicit acts and offensive luxury of Chrysogonus must be an attack on the Dictator himself is logical but superficial. Sulla was too clever for that—and so were the *nobiles*. Sulla probably knew what was going on—whether or no he was already married to Messalla's sister. There is no evidence of any estrangement from the Metelli; and he was proposing to give the consulate to Ap. Pulcher, the husband of Caecilia Metella.

⁷⁵ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 149.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 131, and, in a milder form, 22: *cum tot tantisque negotiis distentus sit* ['when he is mightily occupied by such numerous and such important affairs'].

⁷⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 66.

⁷⁸ Cass. Dio 54.23, etc. Cf. *RR* 410.

⁷⁹ Plut. *Sull.* 2.

⁸⁰ Plut. *Sull.* 36.

⁸¹ Plut. *Crass.* 6. Crassus may in consequence have suffered some retardation in his career, cf. Gelzer, *RE* XIII, 1 298 (Licinius, no. 68).

The defence of Roscius is not a decisive action, driving the Dictator to abdicate. That the case could be successfully conducted is rather a testimony to the gradual return of settled government in 80 BC under the consulate of Sulla and Metellus Pius. The affair was ably conducted. It reflects credit on all concerned—including Sulla.

[20a] If more were known about secret and personal politics in the entourage of the Dictator, the case of Roscius might be the consequence, not the cause of something: Sulla was ready to [discard] his favourite. A parallel may be instructive. It was not until Augustus had recalled Gallus from Egypt and publicly renounced his friendship that the pack of accusers was let loose.

The nature and gravity of the viceroy's offence remains an enigma. The disgrace of so eminent a partisan was not a trifling matter. That Augustus should have taken this step may perhaps be explained by secret politics—the expediency of conciliating an important group of senators at the time when the Princeps was advertising the restoration of Republican government.⁸²

However that may be, Cicero's skill deserves every commendation. He skirts and escapes the pitfall—to argue that his client, if a murderer, is yet guiltless because his parent was proscribed.⁸³ The speech is firm and bold. Even if, as is likely, some passages such as the reference to the unpopularity of the *nobiles* or the purple patch about [21] the scandalous ostentation of Chrysogonus' wealth and luxury be subsequent elaborations,⁸⁴ he could not have falsified the essential political facts—the rôle of Caecilia Metella and the activities of certain young *nobiles*.

The orator was later able to indicate various imperfections of style, such as redundancy and immaturity.⁸⁵ He had every other reason to be proud of the *Rosciana*, like the great *novus homo* Cato, whom he regarded in the light of a spiritual ancestor, Cicero was *haudquaquam detractor laudum suarum*.⁸⁶ But he does not spoil things by iteration and pomposity. His firmest statement is in place, in the *De officiis*—he defended Roscius *contra L. Sullae dominantis opes*.⁸⁷ Cicero saved Rome, several times. But he never claimed to have been instrumental in breaking the great Dictator.

It has been left to the moderns to exaggerate the importance of the affair. Plutarch, it is true, had already misrepresented the situation entirely, though in a different fashion. He alleges that Sulla himself set on foot the prosecution. Nobody would help Roscius. Cicero was his only refuge; and Cicero secured

⁸² For this suggestion, cf. *RR* 310.

[12] ⁸³ Cf. R. Heinze, ['Ciceros politische Anfänge', in *Abh. Sachs. Akad. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl.* 27 (Leipzig 1909) 947–1013 (= *Vom Geist des Römertums* (Leipzig and Berlin 1938) 59–141 = (Stuttgart 1960³) 87–140, at 101–2].

⁸⁴ *Cic. Rosc. Am.* 149; 133–5.

⁸⁵ *Cic. Or.* 108.

⁸⁶ *Livy* 34.15.19: ['not much inclined to shirk from his own praise'].

⁸⁷ *Cic. Off.* 2.51 ['against the power of Sulla, who was then the master'].

his acquittal. In fear of Sulla Cicero then made off to Greece on a valetudinarian pretext.⁸⁸

[22] Sulla, as we know, warned Pompeius against Lepidus; he divined the sinister menace of the young Caesar, and made no secret of his apprehensions. It is unfortunate that inventive fancy, though necessarily felicitous, should be so spasmodic and limited in its operations. No biographer has set down in writing what the sagacious Dictator might have said about Cicero: Arpinum would yet live down the reproach of Marius, the young orator would go far if only he stuck to the *optimates*.

⁸⁸ Plut. *Cic.* 3.

M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 78 BC)

[1] Lepidus made the first attempt to rescind the acts of the Dictator and subvert his constitution. That he was already a declared adversary of Sulla when he stood for the consulate in the summer of 79 BC is now the general doctrine, expounded in narratives both sober and sensational. The opinion might be correct. It depends upon a single witness, Plutarch.¹ So do a number of facts that are never challenged. This time, however, an anecdote is in question, an anecdote that betrays clear symptoms of imperfect authenticity.

Sulla had resigned, but his *auctoritas* might avail to shield the *res publica* of the *nobiles*. How did Lepidus manage to get elected, or even admitted as a candidate? Discarding Plutarch for the moment, and renouncing all foreknowledge of Lepidus' behaviour when consul, it will be expedient to open a new path of enquiry, undisturbed—his antecedent career and allegiance, his family, friends, and allies.

[2] Announced by the apparition of two plebeian consuls in 172 BC, the decline of the patrician *gentes* did not become conspicuous and catastrophic until after the Gracchan *stasis* when the Caecilii Metelli were predominant—only two patricians on the *Fasti* in nine years (120–112 BC), but four Metelli. Before long a further obstruction blocked the claims of birth, the continuous consulates of the military leader C. Marius, in which period one patrician, L. Valerius Flaccus, found admission as colleague (100 BC). The next decade is confused, showing sharp electoral competition and certain remarkable successes of *novi homines* against eminent nobles. When the patricians, strangely enough, were beginning to recover ground again, the *Bellum Italicum* supervened.

Of the Aemilii, some branches had withered and died long ago. More recently, the line of Paullus, the victor of Pydna, had lapsed—two sons passing by adoption to Scipiones and Fabii and two carried off in the season of the Macedonian triumph.² As for the Lepidi, they had not been able to maintain

[All the notes in this paper have been added by the Editor.]

¹ Plut. *Pomp.* 15.1–16.1; *Sull.* 34.4.

² Death of the younger sons: Livy 45.40; Vell. 1.10.3–5; Val. Max. 5.10.2; Cic. *Fam.* 4.6; Plut. *Aem.* 35.1–2. Extinction of this line: Livy 45.41.11. Of the two surviving sons, the eldest became

the primacy bequeathed by the great M. Lepidus, Paullus' rival, *princeps senatus* and *pontifex maximus* during nearly thirty years, though Porcina (*cos.* 137 BC) did his best. For close on half a century before [3] 78 BC, they cannot show a consul. Q. Lepidus, the father of Sulla's enemy, exists only on a family tree, deduced from nomenclature. The solitary consular Aemilius in all this space of time is Scaurus, of an inferior branch struggling up from long obscurity, the man of the Metelli (*cos.* 115 BC).

The Metelli and Marius, *Bellum Italicum* and civil dissension, such was the epoch in which the young Lepidus had to retrieve the dignity and fortune of his family. In the sixth consulate of Marius (100 BC) the Senate advised the executive to safeguard the commonwealth against the *tumultus* provoked by certain mob-leaders, chief among them the praetor C. Servilius Glaucia and the tribune L. Appuleius Saturninus.³ The governing class turned out in force. The eloquence of Cicero nearly forty years later conjures up a famous roll call—the venerable Scaurus, the *princeps senatus*, crippled though he was by gout, old Scaevola, fragile but resolute, all the consulars, all the praetors, the whole *nobilitas* and the young men.⁴ The catalogue is skilful but not pedantic. After the men of consular rank the orator reels off a list of men and families—selecting the most conspicuous that found admittance to the consular [4] *Fasti* in the next twenty-five years or so. Omissions there could not fail to be. They are not significant. The youngest persons to be singled out are four consuls of the years 79–76 BC, P. Servilius, M. Lepidus, Q. Catulus, D. Junius Brutus, and C. Scribonius Curio. The choice explains itself. Four of them were still alive, veritable senior statesmen. Though Lepidus had come to a bad end, the Aemilii enjoyed high prestige, with a recent consul M.' Lepidus (*cos.* 66 BC), and two young men of presumed promise, Paullus and Marcus, the latter of whom was already a *pontifex*. Cicero spoke as consul: the *novus homo* had been able to acquire for his candidature no little support in the influential ranks of the *iuventus*. Social claims were predominant. Cicero also named L. Scipio Asiagenus (*cos.* 83 BC), though he had been a Marian partisan, proscribed and exiled.⁵

[5] That Lepidus should occur in this Ciceronian muster of *nobiles* is a fact not without interest. It concerns Cicero more than Lepidus. Accident reveals Lepidus eleven years later in a very different company. A bronze tablet bears the names of Pompeius' Strabo's *consilium* in the camp at Asculum, November 89 BC.⁶ The staff of Strabo is a strange crew. There were many personal adherents of the Pompeii, especially towards the tail-end, men from Picenum, permitting valuable inferences. Not all the members, however, can

Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus, while the younger became P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus, later Africanus Numantinus: Vell. 1.10.3; Plut. *Aem.* 35.1.

³ *Senatus consultum ultimum* of 100: Vir. Ill. 73.10; Cic. *Cat.* 1.4.

⁴ Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 21.

⁵ Proscription: Oros. 5.21.3; Cic. *Att.* 9.15.2. Exile and death: Cic. *Sest.* 7.

⁶ ILS 8888.

be politically labelled, now or for the future; and Strabo, it will be recalled, was an independent—in the worst sense of the word. Power and ambition explains him, not a party or care for the commonwealth. Sinister lessons might be learned from his company and example. Some profited, diversely. The patrician Catilina belonged to his staff. Also M. Tullius Cicero.⁷

[6] Despite the laurels of Pydna, the Aemilii, taken as a whole, add very little to the glorious record of Rome's wars through the centuries; and Pydna was the victory of a general who had been promoted for reasons of internal politics. M. Lepidus is no exception among the Aemilii. Some of the young *nobiles* left Italy with Sulla, others joined him later in Greece. M. Crassus fled to Spain, Metellus Pius to Africa, gathering followers in the provinces that knew their fathers; Pompeius also contributed a private army when Sulla came back, levied in Picenum, his own country. Lepidus is not among Sulla's generals in the reconquest of Italy—or with his adversaries, where certain eminent *nobiles* are to be found, such as the consul L. Scipio. Lepidus turns up, conveniently and discreetly, after the Battle of the Colline Gate (November 15, 82 BC). He besieges Norba, a city strong in loyalty to the Marian faction, and wins it: treachery had been at work.⁸

[7] Not long after, in 80 BC Lepidus governed Sicily.⁹ He might have been praetor in 81 BC. But that magistracy may lie some years back. The question of Lepidus' age, about which the written sources provide no clear indication, is of some interest. Most of the consuls in the first decade of the restored oligarchy were over the normal age, some of them considerably. The wars operated to produce this result, in two ways. Careers had been retarded, and some elderly survivors were more fortunate than they could ever have hoped, being invited to fill the gaps created by the disappearance of younger rivals. P. Servilius, for example, was well over fifty.¹⁰ Where does Lepidus stand—an old man rancorous, or young ambition, scornful and impatient against the senior oligarchs?

His pedigree discloses a strange fact. The great Lepidus, the *pontifex maximus*, was his grandfather. That is certain. One hundred and nine years therefore had passed since the first consulate of the grandfather (187 BC). The gap is inordinate. One of Lepidus' uncles had been military tribune in 190 BC;¹¹ another of them may perhaps be discovered in the person of M. Aemilius Porcina, [8] consul in 137 BC.¹² It will appear that the *pontifex maximus* in the course of a long and active life (he died in 152 BC) had been able to contract several marriages. It is unfortunate that not even one of his wives should be known by name. Paullus his rival of the other branch stood loyally by the Scipionic connection. The grand pontiff, it might be conjectured,

⁷ Cic. *Phil.* 12.11.27; *Div.* 1.72. ⁸ App. *BC* 1.94.

⁹ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.212.

¹⁰ *RE* s. 2, II, 2A, 1815.

¹¹ Livy 37.43.1.

¹² Cic. *Brut.* 106; App. *Iber.* 80; Oros. 5.4.19.

sought his second or third wife somewhere in the ambit of the Fulvii. The politics of Porcina seem to be anti-Scipionic. If the mysterious Quintus was roughly contemporary with Porcina (*cos.* 137 BC), then his son may belong to the age group represented by Ap. Pulcher (*cos.* 79 BC), D. Brutus and Mam. Lepidus Livianus, consuls in 77 BC. This cannot be proved. Lepidus, like his father Quintus, may be the fruit of a late marriage.

[9] Lepidus' career before the capture of Norba (82 BC) is almost a blank. Some would consider it enough to describe the seditious consul as a Sullan partisan turning renegade through vain ambition. His life might already have witnessed several changes of side. Stray facts are often illuminating. When Lepidus after the failed revolution died in Sardinia, his end was accelerated by grief at the estrangement of his wife, a woman unworthy of his affections. One version speaks of letters, indicating her infidelity; another mentions formal dissolution of the marriage.¹³ She was Appuleia—probably a daughter of L. Appuleius Saturninus. With this marital clue for guidance, multiple duplicities are unravelled—Lepidus despite his illustrious family deserting the cause of the aristocracy in its desperate plight, in 105 BC or shortly after, passing over to the extreme demagogues and marrying their leader's daughter; then, in the catastrophe of 100 BC, he rallied to the forces of law and order, bearing arms against his father-in-law; later, when in the civil war the Marian party was collapsing, he abandoned it for Sulla, and lavish recompense. Finally, betraying his protector, he joined the *nobiles* in the attack on Sulla the [10] monarch, only to turn against them and assert despotic power for himself.

Such vicissitudes do not pass belief. The evidence happens to be inadequate. In 77 BC Lepidus was the husband of Appuleia; it is not at all clear that the marriage then impaired and dissolved through flagrant adultery had already subsisted for some twenty-five years. If the behaviour of Roman matrons, as exemplified in Sallust's perverse panegyric of Sempronia, the wife of D. Brutus (*cos.* 77 BC), might seem to defy the years as well as the proprieties, the reiterated marriages of the *nobiles*, five for Sulla, may provide a reason that nobody need take for a palliation.¹⁴ The ultimate constancy affirmed for Lepidus does not prove that Appuleia was his first wife. Two sons of Lepidus reached the consulate, Paullus (*cos.* 50 BC) and Marcus (*pr.* 49, *cos.* 46 BC), born, it may be presumed, the one in 94 or 93 BC, the other four years later. There was another brother, the eldest, Scipio Lepidus, killed when in command of troops for his father's cause in 77 BC. Lepidus had surrendered him through adoption some years earlier [11] to L. Scipio Asiagenus (*cos.* 83 BC).¹⁵ Nothing proves that these three Lepidi were children of the unsatisfactory Appuleia.

¹³ Infidelity: Plut. *Pomp.* 16.6. Divorce: Pliny *Nat.* 7.36.122.

¹⁴ Plut. *Sull.* 6.10–12 and 35.3–5 names his wives as Ilia/Julia, Aelia, Cloelia, Metella, and Valeria.

¹⁵ Oros. 5.22.17.

The match may well belong, not to the years when the aristocracy was depressed, Marius continuously consul and Saturninus a force in politics (104–100 BC), but much later, when the faction of Marius and Cinna was dominant at Rome, Sulla and the Metelli absent. A Domitius and a Julius then took to wife daughters of L. Cornelius Cinna.¹⁶ Cinna succumbed to assassination during his fourth consulate (84 BC). A young *nobilis*, M. Pupius Piso, quaestor in 83 BC, saw some reason or other for marrying his widow.¹⁷ Policy, perhaps sentiment or caprice, may have drawn Lepidus to Appuleia. She is not the bride of his youth, the mother of his sons, she goes rather with Piso's Annia.

[12] The speech survives which the historian Sallust put into the mouth of L. Philippus, exhorting the Senate to adopt firm and military measures against Lepidus, early in 77 BC. The veteran statesman denounces the actions of the adventurer and exposes his ambition and rapacity. If the material was available for a lengthy catalogue of political treacheries, Philippus has not chosen to exploit it to the full, with damaging detail. He is content with general terms—Lepidus is a traitor to the aristocracy without being loyal to the other side, and he is an enemy of all good citizens.¹⁸

Philippus had his reasons for not expatiating on the theme of changed allegiances. He was himself the great exemplar of well-timed agility. The last twenty-five years offered a bewildering complexity in Roman politics. Not only is the hypothesis of rival parties of *optimates* and *populares*, of policies for the Senate and against, seen to be superficial and fallacious: M. Livius Drusus, the aristocratic demagogue [13] with a programme of Italian enfranchisement, supported by certain of the *principes civitatis*, destroys all facile assumptions. More important, the whole governing class, confronted by rapid crises, splits and divides into factions, according as interest, opportunity, or security dictates, with alliances and combinations that might seem anomalous if they promised any permanence. The old compacts and feuds of the *nobiles* become entangled with political struggles of a universal character, dragging in the knights, involving Italy as well as Rome and ending in civil war.

For ambition or for bare survival the *nobiles* were compelled to take sides. They huddled to the Metelli, packed round a military leader, or sought strength from marriage alliances in the rising mercantile families at Rome or in the towns of Italy. Especially difficult was the position of the patricians, who now almost command sympathy as a depressed class. One branch of the Valerii, the Flacci, drew close to Marius and his faction. So did the Iulii, who had not disdained to surrender [14] one of their womanfolk as bride to Marius

¹⁶ One daughter married Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (Oros. 5.24.16), the other C. Julius Caesar (Suet. *DJ* 1.1, Plut. *Caes.* 1.1).

¹⁷ Vell. 2.41.2.

¹⁸ Sall. *Hist.* 1.77 M. [= 67 McG. = 67 R.].

(?c.110 BC).¹⁹ The nephew of this lady, as all history tells, married a daughter of Cinna (c.85 BC). No less significant is the casual fact that he had been betrothed to a Cossutia, whose family could assert no shadow of political or social distinction; and the sister of this patrician noble, who boasted descent from the kings of Rome and the nobility of Alba Longa, married a person called Pedius.²⁰

After two civil wars—Sulla against Marius in 88 BC and the *Bellum Octavianum*, in rapid sequence—the party of Marius and Cinna seized Rome and held it for nearly five years. Their adherents were rewarded with the spoils of victory and the senators who had not departed with Sulla acquiesced in the new dispensation, some with alacrity and profit. The consulars Philippus and Perperna hold the censorship;²¹ another L. Valerius Flaccus, cousin of the *princeps senatus* becomes consul, and so does L. Cornelius Scipio. Something like a middle party began to form, even to agitate for peace and compromise. In 84 BC the *princeps senatus*, not a bold man, proposed that [15] negotiations be opened with the Republic's general now victorious in the eastern lands.

When Sulla returned and in the first campaign struck hard at his enemies (83 BC), senators hitherto inactive took heart and opportunists made ready to announce their conversion to the better cause.

Sulla used the armistice with L. Scipio to tamper with the consul's troops, no doubt with the connivance of some officers. The stream of defections gathered volume. At the end of it all the victor found himself encompassed by a horde of renegades, large and small, fierce or tame. The surviving *principes*, innocuous or astute, have the place of honour. But lesser men of some notoriety are discerned—P. Cethegus the great intriguer, C. Verres, a quaestor who had run away with the Marian consul's cashbox, and Q. Lucretius Ofella, whose career of promise had to be sharply terminated.²²

One of the neutrals furnishes valuable testimony. During the *Cinnana tempora* the city had been a dreary place—*sine iure fuit et sine dignitate res publica* ['the commonwealth was without law and without dignity'], as Cicero relates in his history of Roman eloquence.²³ Of the eminent [16] orators, most were dead or absent, Cicero was writing in the second epoch of civil wars, under the dictatorship of Caesar (46 BC). The resemblance between past and present pervades the whole work. A merciful death had carried off the great orator L. Licinius Crassus on the eve of the first age of tribulation; the theme of *mortis opportunitas* was developed by Cicero in an earlier treatise, with melancholy splendour.²⁴ The *Brutus* opens with an appropriate exordium,

¹⁹ Plut. *Mar.* 6.2.

²⁰ Cossutia: Suet. *DJ* 1.1; the marriage to a Pedius is inferred from the mention of one of her grandsons, Q. Pedius in Suet. *DJ* 83.2.

²¹ Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.143; Val. Max. 8.13.4; Plin. *Nat.* 7.156.

²² Plut. *Sull.* 33.4.

²³ Cic. *Brut.* 227.

²⁴ Cic. *De or.* 3.3.12 ['the timeliness of death'].

Hortensius' death in 50 BC.²⁵ The parallel with Crassus was so clear and striking that it did not need to be stated.

Hortensius stayed in Rome unmolested under the domination of the Marian party while his brother served as an officer under Sulla. Hortensius already had the primacy in the art of speech. A few other orators were available, and Cicero pursued his studies, declaiming in the company of M. Pupius Piso (q. 83 BC).²⁶ Of Lepidus, however, there is no word in civil as in military history. Cicero's chronicle of Roman authors swells enormously as he approaches his own time and contemporaries, so much so that one of the interlocutors [17] in the *Brutus* is moved to protest more than once: Cicero had got down to the very dregs.²⁷ In all this abundance the name of M. Lepidus is nowhere mentioned. It is idle to speculate whether he had made any attempt or not to emulate the distinction of his uncle Porcina. Cicero's catalogue is not free from the suspicion of partiality. The men he names sometimes owe their inclusion mainly to personal or social reasons. Thus Brutus' parent, though he had been flagrantly on the wrong side. Omission may also be deliberate. Cicero might refer with honour to Lepidus in speeches delivered in 66 or 63 BC. It was different when he composed the *Brutus*. The son of Lepidus was now consul, a partisan of Caesar and personally detested by Cicero—*iste omnium turpissimus et sordidissimus*.²⁸

The veil that hangs over Lepidus refuses to be lifted. Though not perhaps active on the side of the government, this patrician no doubt enjoyed influential protection—L. Scipio Asiagenus (cos. 83) will be surmised; his marriage to Appuleia may belong in these years, and might have some significance. In 86 BC [18] young Pompeius had to face prosecution, an attempt being made to recover public monies embezzled by his father.²⁹ A powerful combination intervened to save him; his advocates were L. Philippus, Hortensius, and the Marian leader Cn. Papirius Carbo (cos. III, 82 BC). Then, after a short period of service under Cinna, Pompeius slipped away, no doubt to take refuge in Picenum, a region largely in the *clientela* of the Pompeii, and there quietly wait upon events. If Lepidus' protectors are unknown, a conjecture can yet be hazarded concerning his whereabouts. The grandfather had property at Taracina, which he embellished from the public funds when holding the office of censor;³⁰ and Lepidus' son, when stripped of his triumviral powers, is relegated to Circeii (36 BC).³¹ Lepidus himself turns up in 82 BC to besiege Norba, only a dozen miles away. Family estates on the coast would be a convenient place for retirement, with the opportunity of rapid escape.

[19] If Lepidus was a Marian partisan, then so were others, whose number and distinction secured them immunity. It was inexpedient to penalise,

²⁵ Cic. *Fam.* 8.13.2; *Att.* 6.6.2. ²⁶ Asc. 15.14. ²⁷ Cic. *Brut.* 269.

²⁸ Cic. *Att.* 9.9.1. ²⁹ Plut. *Pomp.* 4.1–3. ³⁰ Livy 40.51.2.

³¹ Suet. *Aug.* 16.4.

convenient to forget. Their support was necessary to the new government, for Sulla and the Metelli were a minority. Certain *nobiles* who had contracted ties with Sulla's enemies avoided being put on the lists, for example Caesar and M. Piso. Indeed, active partisans were preserved if they had family and social influence behind them. Junii are conspicuous on the Marian side, M. Brutus, the general (*pr.* 88 BC), his homonym, tribune in 83 BC, and L. Junius Damasippus (*pr.* 82 BC). The younger M. Brutus survives. Verres also enjoys protection, perhaps, as a dozen years later, from the Metelli. An irony of fate prolongs his life until the triumviral proscriptions engulf the ex-governor of Sicily in his wealthy exile. Sulla and the Triumvirs were ready to protect birth. On each occasion the principal victims were the knights and the new senators. The children of Norbanus and Carrinas were disfranchised; and it may be guessed that an obscure person like Burrienus, praetor in 83 BC, came to a violent end.

[20] From Sulla's point of view, Lepidus was a valuable acquisition, whatever his past. Lepidus shares in the profits of confiscation, rivalling the rapacity of M. Crassus, and acquires a province to plunder. A palatial mansion and the repair of the Basilica Aemilia paraded the new wealth of this ancient line.³²

The Roman People owed him the consulate as the prerogative of his ancestry; and Sulla, who was eager to resuscitate the patriciate, had only a small field to choose from. The consular *Fasti* are eloquent. From 81 to 79 BC, a patrician each year, then Lepidus, then his kinsman, Mam. Livianus (by birth plebeian). After this the supply seems to shrink. A long gap follows, eleven years down to M.' Lepidus (*cos.* 66 BC), interrupted only by the *Lentuli duo*, 72 and 71 BC, one of whom, Clodianus, was an adopted Marcellus. The success of Sulla's efforts to regain wealth and dignity for the oldest nobility only becomes evident in the last decade of the restored oligarchy: in 57–49 BC inclusive seven of the nine years show a patrician consul. The like had not been seen for nearly a century. This splendour was delusive.

[21] Another computation based on this evidence reveals yet more sharply the dearth of eligible patricians when Sulla was dictator. Of fourteen patricians elected to the consulate in the last generation of the Republic, from Lepidus to Lentulus Crus (78–49 BC), only three can boast consular parents.

The decline of the patriciate had set in before the rise of Marius; then the great wars and murderous politics had thinned their ranks. Lepidus had very few competitors—and few successors in the next decade. For the rest, some youths, like Caesar, M. Messalla, and P. Scipio, such, on a rough estimate is the muster of the patrician *gentes*.

A generation of silence and eclipse might dim the ancient glory of the Aemilii: it could not extinguish their prestige. The two Metelli, Celer and Nepos, dropped their prosecution of the proconsul of Sicily when they saw how popular

³² Mansion: Plin. *Nat.* 36.49, 109. Refurbishment: Plin. *Nat.* 35.13.

he was; and in the Senate L. Philippus when arraigning Lepidus had to rebuke apologists who appealed to past history, to the *gentis Aemiliae bene facta*.³³ [22] Not to go too far back, it is enough to recall the grandfather.³⁴

[23] The progeny of L. Aemilius Paullus being extinct, the Lepidi after a time proceed to enjoy and exploit a reflected glory. Lepidus by usurpation conferred their *cognomen* on one of his sons. He did not forget the younger Scipio, triumphant over Carthage and Numantia, an Aemilius by birth. But the Scipionic tradition was perpetuated now in the line of P. Nasica (*pr.* 94 BC) and entangled with the Metelli: Nasica's mother was a Caecilia, and his son was to be adopted by Metellus Pius. Lepidus sought alliance with another branch. The sole authentication derives from nomenclature, Scipio Lepidus: this young man was killed when commanding troops in Lepidus' insurrection. The inference is easy and acceptable—Lepidus surrendered his eldest son to be adopted by L. Scipio Asiagenus (*cos.* 83 BC), whom ambition impelled to seek advancement with the enemies of the *optimates*: the descendants of Africanus' brother (*cos.* 190 BC) under whose auspices the battle of Magnesia was fought, inherited a *cognomen*, and little besides.

[24] The bare name of Scipio Lepidus encourages speculation about the attitude of two patrician families at Rome under the rule of the Marian faction. It will be profitable to investigate further the relationships of M. Lepidus: an isolated adventurer gaining the consulate is repugnant to the nature of Roman social and political life.

Another name challenges attention, Mam. Lepidus Livianus. It is not too rash to identify him as a brother of M. Livius Drusus (*tr. pl.* 91 BC), adopted by a Mamercus Lepidus otherwise unknown, but presumably an uncle of M. Lepidus. If so, the adoption reinforced an early link between Aemilii and Livii—Mamercus Livianus was a great-grandson of L. Aemilius Paullus. Furthermore, his mother was a Cornelia, probably Scipionic.

Three Junii have been mentioned on the Marian side. A fourth, D. Junius Brutus, became consul in 77 BC with Mam. Livianus. His earlier career is obscure, and so is his later, though he was still alive in 63 BC. When Lepidus raised armed rebellion, he was not supported by D. Brutus or by Livianus. But one of his principal adherents was M. Brutus (*tr. pl.* 83 BC) a survivor from the defeated cause. The character and abilities [25] of this man evade scrutiny. More important perhaps is the identity of his wife. She is Servilia, that great lady so active and potent behind the public façade of Roman politics when Julius Caesar attained to prominence, when he won supreme power—and in the complicated contests after his assassination. Servilia was patrician, a daughter of Q. Servilius Caepio (*pr.* 91 BC), at first the close ally of Livius

³³ Sall. *Hist.* 1.77.6 M. [= 67.6 McG. = 67.6 R.: 'the good deeds of the gens Aemilia'].

³⁴ RE I, 1, 553–4, no. 68 [Note of the Editor: the rest of the page is blank; there appears to be a gap in the text].

Drusus and then his bitterest enemy. Caepio had married Drusus' sister. It follows that a double tie attaches M. Lepidus to this group. Livianus, who became his cousin through adoption, is the uncle of Servilia; and Servilia is the wife of M. Junius Brutus. Further, double Scipionic alliance, by blood through Livianus and Servilia, and by an adoption, as the name and identity of Scipio Lepidus attests.

These are the dominant facts. It will be as well to notice several other connections, even though subordinate. A fragment of Sallust shows Mam. Livianus begging Curio to stand down in his favour: he was the older man, and had previously been defeated at the polls. An impudent request, surely, [26] did not *amicitia* subsist.³⁵ C. Scribonius Curio deferred his candidature to the next year when he was elected, no doubt with the support of Livianus. Between Curio's family and the Aemilii Lepidi some attachment already existed or was soon formed: Curio's son, tribune of the plebs in 50 BC, is described as a kinsman of the consul Paullus, a fact which helped to avert his expulsion from the Senate.³⁶

Sulla brought back to prominence the Cornelii Dolabellae, with the consul of 81 BC and his homonym the praetor, subsequently governors of Macedonia and Cilicia respectively. In the *tumultus* of 100 BC there had perished in the company of Saturninus a *nobilis*, Cn. Dolabella, described as his brother, that is a half-brother: therefore an uncle of Lepidus' wife Appuleia. Further, a L. Dolabella was praetor in that year.

When Caesar returned to Rome from the East on the news of Sulla's death, he was solicited, so it is said, to join Lepidus, but declined: neither enterprise nor leader impressed this sagacious young man.³⁷ The story defies verification. Yet, for Lepidus [27] as for Sulla, Caesar was well worth having; while Caesar, after recent perils to his station and security, saw himself not as another's partisan but as a future consul. Some years later, however, probably in 72 BC, Caesar spoke in favour of the bill proposing amnesty for the participants in Lepidus' revolution: his brother-in-law, Cinna's son was among them.³⁸

Thirty years later, when Caesar took up arms against the oligarchy, reviving several defeated causes or depressed classes at Rome and in Italy, the faction of Lepidus takes shape again. The consular Paullus hung back and stayed neutral, with no gain to a reputation that was distinctly negative in point of vigour or integrity. But revenge and ambition spurred on his brother Marcus (*pr.* 49 BC): a consulate was in sight. P. Servilius, the son of Isauricus, also came over, though his grandmother was a Metella, his previous political activity guided by Cato, and got rapid reward, the consulate in 48 BC. The will and the hand of Servilia may be discerned in the background. These men had married her

³⁵ Sall. *Hist.* 1.75 M. [= 75 McG. = 66 R.].

³⁷ Suet. *DJ* 3.

³⁸ Suet. *DJ* 5.

³⁶ Cass. Dio 40.63.5.

daughters. Servilia's own son, Brutus, went with his uncle Cato to the camp of Pompeius Magnus who had murdered his father.

[28] D. Brutus, the son of the consul of 77 BC, served under Caesar in the Gallic campaigns, and stood by his *imperator*. The younger Curio and a young Dolabella turned to Caesar, largely but perhaps not wholly because of feuds with leading oligarchs. These names suggest the ambit of M. Lepidus; other Caesarians may also belong there.

That such men joined Caesar does not prove that their parents or relatives were in the group of noble families that supported the candidature of M. Lepidus in 79 BC. It is the antecedent connections that matter. Some are very ancient, going back for centuries, such as the relations of the Aemilii with the Servilii and the Junii. More recently, the alliance of Lepidus' grandfather with the Fulvian party (contracted in 180 BC) is a notable fact in dynastic politics. The Aemilii Lepidi seem to stand in opposition to the Scipiones, and then, as time goes on, to the Metelli. Certain families compromised in the Gracchan *stasis* show no consuls ever after. Such was the fate of Fulvii and Sempronii. As for the Junii, one of its members advertised so fanatical [29] an admiration for C. Gracchus as to require the *cognomen* of Gracchanus. The consular Junius Brutus married Clodia, the mother of Gracchus' wife, left a widow in 130 BC.

Brutus, it is recorded, was a kinsman of M. Lepidus Porcina, his successor in the consulship (137 BC).³⁹ Both Aemilii Lepidi and Junii Bruti lurk in obscurity during the next generation.

The group around Lepidus seems largely to consist of families that were left behind or pushed aside in the strife for power in the last fifty years. The patrician *gentes* suffered especially, and in many ways. The catastrophe of Servilia's grandfather Q. Caepio (cos. 106 BC) was a heavy blow; and the civil wars imposed an arduous test of survival. But Sulla, as has been shown, did his best to retrieve nobles and especially patricians who had been involved with the enemies of the oligarchy.

The section of the Roman aristocracy that may be presumed to have backed the candidature of Lepidus now assumes a clearer outline—families decadent or [30] compromised. A negative argument produces confirmation. The Metelli held predominance thirty years before, reinforced it with Sulla and proclaimed their regiment in the persons of the consuls of 79 BC. The party of Lepidus united their rivals, enemies, and victims. The Aemilii Lepidi in all their history betray not the slightest trace of a marriage alliance with the Metelli, or an electoral coalition.

If that fact stands, it would be superfluous to evoke the adversaries of the Metelli in the preceding thirty years: history shifted and changed so often and

³⁹ App. *Iber.* 80.

so rapidly. A single episode may be noted. C. Scribonius Curio (*cos.* 76 BC) does not look like a violent party man. But Curio attests a relationship with the family of Lepidus, hostility to the Metelli. Curio had prosecuted Q. Metellus Nepos (*cos.* 98 BC).⁴⁰ Hence a feud. Nepos on his death-bed adjured his sons not to neglect the sacred duty of revenge.⁴¹

[31] When Sulla the Dictator resigned supreme power and restored the *res publica* to the government of Senate and people, the first sign of the working of *libertas* should have been free elections. That is to say, candidates with their public profession of valour and virtue, while behind the scenes birth, ambition, and money concluded their secret and potent compacts. As soon as the evidence for Roman political life becomes palpable and authentic, with the private correspondence of Cicero, the active part taken by the women of the *nobiles* is unmistakable. It was nothing new. The operations of Lepidus' faction running true to aristocratic tradition in this generation, as in the next, when the old fashion of family politics was overborne, but not superseded, by the military dynasts, no doubt exploited to the full the influence of women. If Servilia, the wife of M. Junius Brutus, was still a novice, not yet having attained to her full stature as a political intriguer, others were available.

Sallust in the *Bellum Catilinae* [32] draws a full-length portrait of the accomplished Sempronia, whom he charges with complicity in the conspiracy, without however producing any evidence about her activities.⁴² Sempronia was the wife of D. Junius Brutus (*cos.* 77 BC). She was then far from her first youth. Sallust asserts that she had many actions of masculine audacity to her credit. Sempronia's past might have been involved in Lepidus' candidature—and Lepidus' rebellion. Sallust's Sempronia is unsurpassable. When he came to compose the *Historiae*, starting from the consulate of Lepidus, he may well have regretted his precipitancy, that artistic zeal which wasted on a monograph the classic portrayal of the political lady. If the true return of aristocratic politics in Sulla's oligarchy were to be properly exposed, the historian needed the type, whether it was to be embodied in Sempronia in her prime, the young Servilia, or a female influential though outside the *nobilitas* such as Praecia, the mistress of that political adept, the renegade P. Cornelius Cethegus.⁴³

[33] Though intrigues and compacts the enquiry converges on Lepidus' election. According to Plutarch, he stood as a declared enemy of Sulla; not his own influence but that of Pompeius got him in.⁴⁴ The story appears more and more suspect. Ancestry and aristocratic connections prove Lepidus a powerful candidate, while Pompeius, to judge by his recent marriage, should have been with the Metelli. One hypothesis, it is true, conjures up a general coalition,

⁴⁰ Asc. 63.6–64.10; Apul. *Apol.* 66.4.

⁴¹ Asc. 63.19–21.

⁴² Sall. *Cat.* 25.

⁴³ Plut. *Luc.* 42.2–5.

⁴⁴ Plut. *Sull.* 34.4–5 and *Pomp.* 15.

everybody against Sulla: which is unlikely, were it not superfluous for the simple reason that Sulla had already resigned at the beginning of the year.⁴⁵

Much turns on the manner of the elections, and the only explicit testimony is that of Plutarch. Sulla rebukes Pompeius—not for defeating a candidate of the *optimates* but for shoving in Lepidus in front of the other consul, the excellent Catulus. If it is to be accepted, the story might seem to suggest that there were only two candidates. Such a procedure for averting *stasis* in the governing class and presenting an outward show of concord in the restored aristocracy would have had much to commend it. There was a real fissure, between the Metelli and a large [34] group whose loyalty to the *causa nobilium* had recently been impaired or intermittent. After Pius, Ap. Pulcher, and P. Servilius the Metelli were short of suitable candidates. On the other hand, Lepidus was a patrician, his following influential. The consulate of Lepidus and Catulus may represent a compromise. Indeed, the theory is tenable either way, whether the elections were managed or free.

On the latter assumption, it would be entertaining to speculate about the field. Two classes can be distinguished, the praetors of 81 BC and men some seven years or more their senior, the coevals of Metellus Pius and Ap. Pulcher. Hardly any of the praetors of 81 BC are known by name—and none a match for Lepidus in social distinction. An older man was available, his cousin Mamercus Livianus, who attained to the consulate the year after, Curio amiably standing down in favour of his senior. Curio, who had been tribune of the plebs in 90 BC, was not so very young himself. Livianus had previously been rejected by the *comitia*. The reason [35] for his defeat happens to be on record. The Roman People remembered that Livianus had defrauded them of spectacles by omitting the aedileship, though an exceedingly wealthy man.⁴⁶ Livianus might have stood in 79 BC. If so, when Lepidus came in first at the polls he had to retire from the contest, for a patrician pair was inadmissible. Yet Livianus' *repulsa* could lie many years back, almost in another generation of Roman politics. He commanded troops as a legate in the *Bellum Italicum*.⁴⁷ Analogy suggests that his rank was praetorian. Mam. Livianus may be a failed candidate of the period 92–87 BC.

The attempt to elucidate the social and political entourage of M. Lepidus, a necessary operation if one is not prepared to acquiesce in suspicious anecdotes, carries the assumption that Mamercus was among the supporters of his cousin—at least in 79 BC. The enquiry is beset with hazards and pitfalls. Mamercus might be a rival candidate, splitting the family group in the interests of the Metelli who needed a patrician colleague for Q. Lutatius Catulus. [36] An estrangement between the cousins is attested. The cause and occasions needs to be established. In the famous harangue in the first book

⁴⁵ Cf. the discussion in 'The Abdication of Sulla', no. 4.

⁴⁶ Cic. *Off.* 2.58.

⁴⁷ Livy *Per.* 76.6.

of Sallust's *Historiae* the consul Lepidus denounces certain *nobiles* as torpid and degenerate, as servile ministers of Sulla's despotism.⁴⁸ One is Catulus, his colleague. This is comprehensible. The others are Mam. Livianus and D. Brutus, consuls in 77 BC. The dramatic date of the speech is early in 78 BC. Yet at that time the identity of the consuls of the next year was not known—in fact they were not elected until after the beginning of the year to which they lend their name, 77 BC. Sallust is guilty of an anticipation—his choice of persons to abuse is determined by the subsequent course of events. It is not safe to infer that Livianus and Brutus were already adversaries of Lepidus, or had not ranked among his allies at the elections in the previous summer.

[37] Elections at Rome were contests of persons or factions. If as rarely happened, a candidate had a programme, it was well to dissemble and not compromise his chances by the introduction of dangerous irrelevancies. Thus Q. Cicero in the electioneering manual drawn up for his brother's guidance warns him to keep off politics.⁴⁹ The actions of Caesar's consulate could not have been foretold from his candidature; and a consul's change of allegiance might well disappoint the prime authors of his advancement (as Fannius in 122 BC, Q. Metellus in 60 BC).

When Lepidus during his consulate went from bad to worse, threatening to subvert the rule of Sulla's oligarchy, he gained partisans—and forfeited allies. If the Marian party was to rear its head again, and the exiles return, Cinna's son, M. Perperna and others, the more fortunate survivors of defeated causes or the noble families recently emergent from long decay trembled for status and security, and drew back in haste. Hence the wrath of Lepidus against Mamercus and D. Brutus, dumb *nobiles* and deaf to *Libertas*.

[38] That Lepidus the consul turned out very different from Lepidus the candidate need occasion no surprise. Were he already meditating the programme that emerges during his consulate, elementary prudence should have dissuaded a premature proclamation. Why warn his enemies gratuitously or betray his hand before he held *imperium*? To approach an electoral body the composition of which was designed to give an overwhelming preponderance to wealth, to advertise, not the *bene facta gentis Aemiliae* and many noble adherents but open hostility to the new order in state and society, this was peculiar and anomalous by the political canons of any age or country.

[39] Lepidus ended in armed rebellion. That he should announce his candidature by an open attack on Sulla and Sulla's system—and thereby secure election—is an inordinate simplification. The origin and development of the whole crisis is ignored. The prime document, Lepidus' speech according to Sallust, is highly perplexing. It is a virulent harangue against Sulla, his acts, his *tyrannis*, and all the agents and beneficiaries, from *nobiles* down to such

⁴⁸ Sall. *Hist.* 1.55.2–3 M. [= 1.48.2–3 McG. 1. 49.2–3 R.].

⁴⁹ *Comm. Pet.* 13.

creatures as the unspeakable Fufidius and Vettius from Picenum—and even lower. Sulla is designated as *scaevus iste Romulus* ('left-handed Romulus'); the themes of proscription, murder, and oppression are generously developed; and the oration winds up with a solemn appeal to the Roman People to follow their consul as leader and champion in the fight for liberty.

On the face of things, the *Oratio Lepidi* is an attack on the Dictator still invested with his tremendous powers. One man controls laws and law courts, treasury provinces and vassal kings; he asserts that peace and order can only be safeguarded if he held all the sovereignty that had belonged to the Roman People; he rules by crime and treachery; he still parades in [40] pomp and pride, though his despotism is rotten within and doomed to collapse. Further, personal accusations of Sulla against Lepidus are rebutted: he had called Lepidus *sediciosus*, he adverted upon Lepidus' profits from the proscriptions. The impression is deceptive. Lepidus assumed the *fasces* on January 1, 78 BC. Sallust chose that point for the opening of his *Historiae*. On any count or theory Sulla had been a private citizen for many months.

The *Oratio Lepidi*, as composed and contrived by Sallust belongs early in 78 BC, before the death of Sulla. Sulla died in the spring. The chronology and interpretation of this year's history is far from easy. It appears that Sulla's death released the crisis. Lepidus' harangue, however, is a declaration of war not only on the Sullan system but on Sulla's person. Its tone and timing seems wrong: is such an attack likely to have been delivered while Sulla was still alive? If he was no longer dictator, no longer at Rome, his *auctoritas* yet protected the Republic, with his *potentia*, the veterans, in the background, to deter rebellion.

Literary artifice explains the anomaly. Sallust conceived the theme of his *Historiae* as the decline and fall of the oligarchy: Sulla was the personification of the oligarchy. To launch the attack on the system, not the man, [41] was tame and feeble. Sallust aspired to vividness and concentration. The *scaevus Romulus* had to be alive and formidable. To achieve his design, Sallust does not scruple to tamper with the order of events. Mere facts must give way to artistic verisimilitude. The historian boldly antedates the revolutionary manifesto of Lepidus.

His *Catilina* provides an exact parallel. The conspiracy arose from Catilina's defeat at the elections in 63 BC, the second running. Two *repulsae* were regarded as pretty conclusive at Rome; and the resort to violence is a confession of political failure. But Sallust chooses to put the inception of the plot more than a year earlier, before the elections of 64 BC. He produces a manifesto of the revolutionary: it was delivered about the beginning of June in the presence of a full muster of the partisans, from *nobiles* down to municipal adherents. The manipulation is evident. No less the purpose. It is not a clever (yet perhaps superfluous) attempt to disculpate Caesar. Sallust is not just a Caesarian apologist, but the deadly and subtle adversary of a whole régime and

a whole society. He sets out to demonstrate that Catilina and his crew are the natural [42] products of an evil system: Catilina was a *nobilis*, one of Sulla's men, early baptised in blood and crime. The conspiracy is organic and symbolic. To concede that a mere electoral defeat was its cause would have spoiled Sallust's design.

In the *Historiae* Sallust proposed to narrate the decline and fall of the Sullan oligarchy. The preface contained, as was proper, general observations on history and historians at Rome.⁵⁰ A work beginning with the year 78 BC demanded an exposition of the political situation. Sallust furnishes it, vividly, in the form of a speech: an indictment of Sulla's Republic, which at the same time is a diagnosis of the conditions propitious to revolution, to that revolution, which broke out as soon as Sulla died. In Roman historiography the *Oratio Lepidi* corresponds to certain chapters in the first book of Tacitus' *Historiae*.

The harangue is a call to action, even to arms, but it does not lay down any definite programme. It may imply, but it does not advocate, return of the exiles or restoration of the tribunate. The only positive proposal, indeed, is Lepidus' own offer to surrender the property he had acquired during the proscriptions.

[43] The *Oratio Lepidi* cannot with safety be utilised as evidence for Lepidus' behaviour before Sulla was dead. Still less can it be transported back to the electoral campaign, if such there was, in 79 BC Sallust's manipulation braves the licence normally conceded to historians. Dramatic concentration is in conflict with the exigencies of an annalistic narrative that began at 78 BC. Sallust is audacious, doubly so. He brings Lepidus out into the open while Sulla is still alive—and he implies that Sulla is still dictator, though carefully eschewing the name. A slight palliation may be invoked. The actual abdication was not so very important. Sulla, even though he had resigned, was still powerful. Becoming a symbol, he did not cease to be a reality; even his corpse was feared and formidable.

[44] Apart from the *Oratio Lepidi*, which looks explicit but turns out deceptive and demands to be interpreted by Sallustian canons of the higher verisimilitude, the evidence about Lepidus' revolution is meagre and fragmentary, defying a coherent narrative. The two consuls belonged to opposing factions in the *nobilitas*, for all that their divergences were abated for the moment or sedulously disguised in the interest of propriety and concord when Sulla restored the Republic. Rivalry may be surmised between Lepidus and Catulus, a personal antipathy. Appian says that they were enemies, at variance from the first day of their consulate.⁵¹

The death of Sulla provoked open enmity. Lepidus and his party were for refusing a public funeral. Catulus and the *optimates* prevailed—and Pompeius

⁵⁰ Sall. *Hist.* 1.3, 9–10, 12 M. [= 1.5, 6, 12, F 3 McG. = 1.5, inc. 45, 7, 12 R.].

⁵¹ App. *BC* 1.105.

was active on their side, so it is alleged. After the ceremony the consuls parted with angry words.

Personal or partisan rivalry now merged in a political struggle and proceeded through revolutionary proposals or actions to a violent issue. Neither the order of events nor the rhythm can be traced with precision. [45] As a demagogic measure, Lepidus proposed a bill for cheap corn. Yet he proclaimed that it was not expedient that the tribunes be reinstated in their powers. It would appear that the consul had not yet adopted or announced as his programme a complete subversion of Sulla's constitution.⁵² Disturbances in Italy set the train alight. Etruria began to stir. On the news of Sulla's death dispossessed proprietors at Faesulae had made an attack upon the veteran colonists.⁵³ On the Senate's instructions both consuls went out to restore order. It was now that Lepidus, in command of troops, began to be dangerous, asserting the Marian cause. The Senate took alarm and constrained the consuls by oath not to resort to civil war. Lepidus remained ambiguous and refused to return to Rome to hold the consular elections.

Time passed, the government was feeble, the strength and the pretensions of Lepidus increased. The year ended. Lepidus acquired the Cisalpina—if it was not his province by law, his ally M. Brutus held it for him.⁵⁴ Lepidus [46] now maintained that the oath bound him no longer. He made ready to support his claims by force—among them the return of the exiles and a second consulate for himself.

The Senate now found a leader. There were no consuls to guide, or execute, its policy. But the veteran L. Philippus, summoning the energy that threw him across the path of M. Livius Drusus fourteen years before, came forward to save the Republic like a true *princeps*. He infused courage in the high assembly and carried the ultimate decree, instructing magistrates and all in possession of *imperium* to defend the Republic.⁵⁵

Lepidus marched on Rome. Catulus defeated him in battle in the Campus Martius.⁵⁶ In the meantime Pompeius, striking at the basis of Lepidus' power, advanced into the Cisalpina and besieged Brutus at Mutina. Brutus surrendered, or was betrayed, and Pompeius put him to death, not escaping the reproach of perfidy or cruelty. Lepidus after another defeat at Cosa on the coast of Etruria made his escape to Sardinia, and a miserable death. Even his funeral pyre was mismanaged.

[47] Such, in the barest outline, is the story of Lepidus' revolution. Brevity has its advantages. The attempt to provide a full and explicit narrative would involve endless complications. For the above summary of what happened

⁵² Gran Lic. p. 33.14–34.4 Flemisch [= p. 27.4–27.7 Criniti].

⁵³ Gran. Lic. p. 34.8–35.1 Flemisch (= p. 28.3–6 Criniti).

⁵⁴ Livy *Per.* 90.3; Plut. *Pomp.* 16.1–2; App. *BC* 1.107.

⁵⁵ Sall. *Hist.* 1.67 M. ⁵⁶ App. *BC* 1.107.

between Sulla's funeral and that of Lepidus it may be claimed that it does not contradict any reputable pieces of evidence.

Enough survives of the ancient sources to show that the political situation changed and developed, even though the acts and the stages cannot be arranged in their proper order and relation. This is fundamental. The insurrection does not proceed in accordance with a deep-laid plan or with a programme either boldly or carelessly advertised when Lepidus came forward as a candidate.

Erected on murder and robbery, the Republic of Sulla invited revolution. The rôle devolved on Lepidus. Ambition and opportunism produced a champion of the Marian cause. To interpret his earlier career in the light of his consulate is a simple [48] and superficial procedure. If Lepidus had previously been a timid and tepid adherent of the *optimates*, if he had been compromised by his conduct in the civil wars, few of the *nobiles* were above reproach. The facile designation of Lepidus as a Marian partisan or a renegade will be deprecated. None the less, examination of the family history of the Lepidi, their alliances, and entourage reveals a political group, decayed nobles and survivors of defeated causes, largely to be defined by hostility to the Metelli. Prophetic anecdotes and historical anticipations being discounted, Roman families and Roman factions render intelligible both the candidature of Lepidus and the actions of his consulate.

Satellites of Sulla

[1] One of the devices affected by the historian Sallust (obvious enough) is to slip in evocative names, vivid to any reader or designed to recur in the narration. And some carry condemnatory labels of identity.

Sallust invented an oration to denounce Sulla. He puts it into the mouth of the consul Lepidus early in the *Historiae*. Much play is made with the opprobrious term *satelles*. First, and close to the exordium, the speaker rebukes aristocratic adherents of the Dictator—*satellites quidem eius, homines maximi nominis, optimis maiorum exemplis*. And he is not slow to specify—*praeclara Brutorum atque Aemiliorum et Lutatiorum proles, geniti ad ea quae maiores virtute peperere subvertenda*.¹

The references are clear. First the colleague and rival of M. Aemilius Lepidus in the consulship of 78, Q. Lutatius Catulus. Next, another Aemilius and a Junius Brutus, the consuls who in fact were elected for 77, but, because of the disturbances, not elected until the year had begun.

D. Junius Brutus was well on in years, being apparently a son of that D. Brutus (*cos.* 137) whose campaigns in Hispania Ulterior earned the *cognomen* 'Callaicus'. Before his consulship nothing is known about this man; Cicero's assertion that he stood on the right side in 100 against Saturninus and Glaucia will be interpreted as it deserves, a mere compliment to a senior consular still among the living.² Brutus is clearly one of those nobiles who had lurked at Rome, safe and inconspicuous during the domination of Cinna, to come out in time and help the victorious cause. From first to last he remains obscure, barely mentioned after 77. [2] Cicero, to be sure, inserted a complimentary notice in his *Brutus*.³ This consular was a person of refined taste, *et Graecis doctus litteris et Latinis* ['educated in the Greek and Roman letters']. No speech or lawsuit, even of the most trivial, confirms a claim to eloquence. It is something of a surprise to learn that he was still alive in 63.⁴ All but extinct, with no place in the momentous actions and debates of November and December.

¹ Sall. *Hist.* 1.55.22 M. [= 48.22 McG. = 49.22 R.: 'distinguished offspring of the Bruti, the Aemilii and the Lutatii, born to overthrow what their ancestors brought about by their prowess'].

² Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 21.

³ Cic. *Brut.* 175.

⁴ Sall. *Cat.* 40.5.

Brutus passed away not long after. For Cicero, writing in 45, it was a question whether or no his old mother Clodia had outlived him.⁵

In truth, the posthumous fame of that aristocrat is guaranteed only by his wife and son—Sempronia, the political lady whom Sallust put in high prominence, and Decimus Brutus, for long years in the company of Caesar, and enjoying high favour, but none the less won over by Cassius and Brutus.

His consular colleague, Mam. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus, is enigmatic on various counts. Patently a Livius Drusus adopted by an Aemilius, and is presumed a brother of M. Livius Drusus (*tr. pl.* 91), hence among other things the maternal uncle of Cato.⁶ The adopting parent evades scrutiny, as do other Aemilii Lepidi in that age, such as Quintus, parent of M. Lepidus (*cos.* 78) or Manius, parent of M.' Lepidus (*cos.* 66).⁷ For all that is known he might be a brother of that insubstantial Quintus.⁸

Mamercus is attested in the field as a legate in the *Bellum Italicum*.⁹ Then complete silence for a dozen years, unless the Lepidus who took Norba by treachery in 82 is he, not Marcus.¹⁰

Like others of the consuls after Sulla, he looks rather elderly. A fragment of the *Historiae* is relevant. Before a consular election somebody (perhaps the senior statesman [3] Marcius Philippus) put in a plea in his favour, bringing pressure on another candidate—*Curionem quaesit ut adulescentior et a populi integer aetati concederet Mamerci*.¹¹ Now C. Scribonius Curio (*tr. pl.* 90) cannot have been born much later than 125.¹²

The occasion is clearly the election in and for 77. Mamercus had previously suffered a defeat, as a passage in Cicero reveals—*Mamerco, homini divitissimo, praetermissio aedilitatis consulatus repulsam attulit*.¹³ When was that? Perhaps many years back. Possibly, however, in 79. The only evidence about that context is the peculiar anecdote: Sulla blames Pompeius for helping Lepidus to come in ahead of Catulus, and he duly utters ominous vaticinations.¹⁴ No other candidate is named in the story. It would be worth knowing if Mamercus stood in that year. If so, not as an ally of his cousin, for both were patrician.

Like his colleague D. Brutus, Mam. Lepidus showed no alacrity for a command in Spain against Sertorius. Hence the witticism of Marcius Philippus—they had to send Pompeius not merely *pro consule* but *pro consulibus*.¹⁵ Mamercus fades out after his consulship. His name stands in no transactions of Roman politics.

⁵ Cic. *Att.* 12.22.2.

⁶ RA 311–14; table, 313.

⁷ Livy *Per.* 76.

⁸ Diod. 37.2.10.

⁹ Livy *Per.* 76.6.

¹⁰ App. *BC* 1.94.

¹¹ Sall. *Hist.* 1.86 M. [= 75 McG. = 75 R.: 'he asked Curio as a younger man and one who had not been repulsed in a popular vote to concede priority to Mamercus on the ground of age'].

¹² RE II.A, 862, no. 10.

¹³ [Cic. *Off.* 2.58: 'having sidestepped the aedileship caused Mamercus, a very wealthy man, a defeat in the consular election']

¹⁴ Plut. *Pomp.* 9.

¹⁵ Sall. *Hist.* 1.77.11 M. [= 1.67.11 McG. and R.].

When did Mamercus die? An incident concerning Cato, narrated before Cato's military service in 72, is taken to imply his decease.¹⁶ Cato was eager to acquire for wife a girl named Lepida.¹⁷ She had previously been betrothed to P. Scipio Nasica (the later Metellus Scipio), who broke the contract but changed his mind and took her from Cato and [4] married her. Hence a bitter quarrel. This Lepida (nobody doubts it) is the daughter of Mam. Lepidus Livianus, and cousin of Cato, also a great heiress. There is no word of her father in the story.

Other claims are adduced for his survival. The record mentions a Mamercus fighting a battle for Lucullus in Asia at the time of the siege of Cyzicus.¹⁸ Also a Mamercus commanding a fleet for M. Antonius (*pr.* 74) in his operations on the coast of Liguria.¹⁹ These notices import perplexity. It was a late season for the elderly and opulent consular to be serving as a legate anywhere. One or other of these Mamerci might be his son—not that any son happens to be attested. Further one should not lose sight of the *gentilicium* 'Mamercius'. The town of Arpinum discloses Mamercii as a family of local magistrates.²⁰ A Mamercius could have served as legate or praefect under M. Antonius. Among his *legati* was a Manius.²¹ The *nomen* is on attestation at Tibur.²²

There is another item touching the survival of Mam. Lepidus Livianus. It is the name of one of the *pontifices* present at that banquet famed in the annals of gastronomy which Macrobius by happy accident preserves.²³ The party was given by the *pontifex maximus*, Q. Metellus Pius, when inaugurating the *flamen Martialis* L. Lentulus Niger (later *cos. cand.* in 59). An acute study establishes the date. It ought to fall between 73 and 69.²⁴ Caesar (one of the named *pontifices*) was co-opted in 73; and 69 is the latest date for the entry of P. Sulpicius Galba (*cos. cand.* in 64), whose coins, struck when he was curule aedile, exhibit the [5] emblems of the pontificate. The name in question stands on the list as 'M. Aemilius Lepidus'. At once a difficulty. Given the approximate date, the person cannot be Marcus the son of the consul of 78, who was curule aedile in 52, praetor in 49, consul in 46. He happens, it is true, to be attested as *pontifex*, but much later, in 57, by the list in a Ciceronian speech.²⁵ Therefore the *praenomen* has to emended: not 'M.', but 'Mam.' That is easy enough, and reasonable. If accepted, this solution would put the document in Macrobius at the earliest date permissible—and also the latest date conciliable with Cato's aspirations to the heiress, the daughter of Mamercus.

¹⁶ Plut. *Cato* 7.9.

¹⁷ Cf. *RA* 314.

¹⁸ Oros. 6.2.16.

¹⁹ Sall. *Hist.* 3.5 M. [= 3.6 McG. = 3.6 R.].

²⁰ Cic. *Fam.* 13.11.1.

²¹ [Sall. *Hist.* 3.6 M. = 3.7 McG. = 3.7 R.]

²² [RE XIV, 1, 1147–8.]

²³ Macrobi. *Sat.* 3.11.3.

²⁴ L. R. Taylor, 'Caesar's Colleagues in the Pontifical College', *AJP* 63 (1942), 385–412, at 388–400; cf. *MRR* [II, 113–14].

²⁵ Cic. *Har. resp.* 12.

Doubts might be conceived. The only other solution is to change the *praenomen* of the *pontifex*, not in one place but in two, in Cicero as well as in Macrobius, so as to exclude both Marcus and Mamercus. That is to say, the doubly attested *pontifex* (in 73–69 and in 57) is the unobtrusive but influential M. Aemilius Lepidus, consul in 66 with L. Volcacius Tullus.

Sallust insists on undermining the *nobiles*. When he composed the *Oratio Lepidi*, arraigning Sulla and the proscriptions, an aristocrat he knew and loathed was not absent from his thoughts: the son of that Lepidus, the Triumvir who in alliance with Antonius and Octavianus brought back the era of murder and confiscation.

The movement of the speech is convergent and subversive—against Sulla, against the *nobiles*, against the Triumvirs. And to men of understanding, it also demolished the speaker. [6] Contemptuous first of all about the aristocratic adherents of the Dictator, Sallust goes lower, linking through the term *satelles* [‘attendant’] the proud historic names with spies, assassins, and profiteers.

Next, therefore, the orator brings on in angry or pathetic language those *pauci satellites* who have occupied the ancestral lands of *plebs innoxia*.²⁶ That was the recompense of crime. A pair of typical names emerges quickly, *Vettius Picens et scriba Cornelius*. Finally, lower still, the *satellites commaculati*.²⁷ Roman soldiers shed their blood, the profit went to Tarula and Scirtus, *pessumi servorum* [‘the worst of slaves’].

The names repay inspection—and demand it anyhow, there being no adequate commentary on the speeches in the *Historiae*. About Vettius Picens, no shadow of a doubt. This is L. Vettius, the notorious informer.²⁸ He was not in fact one of the Catilinarians, but he was able to produce various revelations. He reported the intrigues of the two Claudii Marcelli in the Paelignian country; and he tried to incriminate Caesar in 62.²⁹ Enough, therefore, with Cicero to acclaim and dismiss him as *Vettius ille, ille noster index*.³⁰ It should be added, however, that he is patently L. Vettius L. f. Vel. present in the *consilium* of the consul Cn. Pompeius Strabo at Asculum in 89.³¹ The list offers other characters of some interest such as ‘M. [Aem]ilius Q. f. Pal.’, that is the future consul, and ‘L. Sergius L. f. Tro.’, who owns to the *cognomen* ‘Catilina’.

There is another Vettius who can and must be kept apart from the Picentine informer, namely Vettius the dealer in real property. There is a strong temptation to equip him with [7] the *cognomen* ‘Scato’. Cicero in the speech *De domo* alleges that Clodius is dishonestly seeking to acquire his mansion on the Palatine under cover of an agent called Scato who himself has not a roof to

²⁶ § 12.

²⁷ § 21: *nam praeter satellites commaculatos quis eadem vult aut quis non omnia mutata praeter victoriam?* [‘For, apart from his defiled retainers, who wants the same as he, or who does not want everything changed apart from victory?’, trans. A. J. Woodman.]

²⁸ RE VIII A, 1844–50, no. 6.

²⁹ [Suet. *DJ* 17;] Oros. 6.6.7.

³⁰ [Cic. *Att.* 2.24.2: ‘the famous Vettius, that informer of ours’.]

³¹ CIL 1².709.

cover his head in his own country—in *Marsis ubi natus est*.³² The name Vettius Scato recalls one of the generals of confederate Italy, hence the strong suspicion that the house agent belongs to a local dynastic house now reduced to trade and commerce. In another place Cicero, who had been present in the consul's army, records how Pompeius Strabo had an interview with an insurgent leader, *cum P. Vettio Scatone, duce Marsorum*.³³

Not a problem arises. The *Bellum Italicum* was also termed *Bellum Marsicum*, therefore the *dux Marsorum* of Cicero might be general, not specific and ethnic. Further, a late writer, describing the suicide of the insurgent leader, calls him *C. Vettium Paelignum Italicensem*.³⁴ Most scholars therefore assume that Vettius Scato was in fact the commander of the Paelignan contingent.³⁵

Next, the scribe Cornelius. He is sometimes taken to be a freedman of the Dictator, one of that notorious company of ten thousand liberated slaves.³⁶ That is not likely. The *scribae* were a fine body of men, responsible and respectable, most of them equestrian. A scribe had been known to reach a curule magistracy in an earlier time (C. Cicereius, *pr.* 173).

This one can be identified. Cicero in *De officiis* (written in the summer of 44) compares the two dictatorships, with hostile comment on P. Sulla, a double profiteer and more criminal the second time. He goes on to an anonymous reference—*alter autem qui in illa dictatura scriba fuerat* [8] *in hac fuit quaestor urbanus*.³⁷ Everything now becomes clear, and a *praenomen* can be attached, for a decree preserved by Josephus registers Q. Cornelius as *quaestor urbanus*, precisely in 44.³⁸ That is not all. He can be traced in the intervening years. Q. Cornelius is one of the three *pontifices minores* present at the banquet of Metellus Pius in the period 73–69, and he recurs in the same function in 57.³⁹ Of his two companions at the banquet, one is P. Albinovanus, perhaps the renegade who had betrayed Norbanus in 82. The other, P. Volumnius, could be held identical with the juryman of that name attested in 66. And he may well be the *patronus* of the famous freedman P. Volumnius Eutrapelus.⁴⁰

³² Cic. *Dom.* 116 ['among the Marsians, where he was born']. See R. G. Nisbet, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Domo Sua ad Pontifices Oratio* (Oxford 1939) 167.

³³ Cic. *Phil.* 12.27. ³⁴ Macrobian. *Sat.* 1.12.24.

³⁵ E. T. Salmon, 'Notes on the Social War', *TAPA* 89 (1958), 159–84, at 173; H. Gundel, *RE* VIII A, col. 1854–6; E. Gabba, *Appiani Bellorum Civilium Liber Primus* (Florence 1958) 133.

³⁶ So V. Paladini (ed.), *C. Sallusti Crispi Orationes et epistulae de Historiarum libri excerptae* (Bari 1957) 84. See App. *BC* 1.100; *CIL* 1².722.

³⁷ Cic. *Off.* 2.29 ['the one who had been a scribe in that dictatorship, and was an urban quaestor in this one'].

³⁸ Jos. *AJ* 14.219. R. Syme, 'Caesar, the Senate, and Italy', *PBSR* 14 (1938), 1–38, at 13 [= *RP* 1.88–119, at 101]; id., review of Broughton, *MRR* I–II, *CP* 50 (1955), 134; *MRR* Suppl., 17–18.

³⁹ Macrobian. *Sat.* 3.13.11; Cic. *Har. resp.* 12.

⁴⁰ Cic. *Clu.* 198; *MRR* 135. A senator in *RE* II, 17, 875, no. 8. Cf. R. Syme, review of Broughton, *MRR* I–II, *CP* 50 (1955), 127–38, at 136; 'Who was Vedius Pollio?', *JRS* 51 (1961), 23–30, at 26–7 [= *RP* 2.518–29, at 524–5].

That is to say, like L. Vettius, Q. Cornelius is a person the historian could not miss. The former's murky career terminated in 59, when, after disclosures about a plot to murder Pompeius, Cicero, and others, he was put into prison, where he died quickly and conveniently. Not without imputations against Caesar—which may have become vocal after the Ides of March.⁴¹ The quaestor Q. Cornelius also called up the past.

Last and lowest, Tarula and Scirtus. Their names damn them. Scirtus is plain. It is a servile name, attested in a play of Terence.⁴² It occurs later on inscriptions, being borne by freedmen of Caesar, of Augustus, of Claudius. Nor will one omit the famous charioteer of the *factio alba* who proclaims on stone his many victories between AD 12 and 25.⁴³ The local origin is also clear, Illyrian. There was a people of Scirtones or Scirtari in Dalmatia, in the *conventus* of Narona. Pliny registers the Scirtari with their seventy-two *decuriae*.⁴⁴ [9] Observe also a marine from the Ravenna fleet, which was largely recruited from Dalmatians—C. Valerius Annaei f. Dasius Scirt. ex Dalmat[ia].⁴⁵

Though Tarula is absent from a standard work of reference, one does not have to look far. It is attested as a slave name, and it is patently Thracian.⁴⁶ It develops a *gentilicium*, Tarulius or Tarullius, which is suitably discovered in the Misenum fleet. Names of persons and of places with the root 'Tar-' are found in Illyricum as well as Thrace, for example Tariona and the river Tara. Also, and significantly, in certain regions of Italy.⁴⁷

To any Roman, Tarula and Scirtus cried their origin. Another Illyrian is disclosed in the entourage of Sulla, not a thug, but a scholar and author: Cornelius Epicadus, who had a hand in editing the memoirs of the Dictator.⁴⁸ There is also an Asinius Epicadus who in the late years of Augustus formed a plan, along with a certain L. Audasius, to rescue Agrippa Postumus from his island prison of Planasia.⁴⁹ Clearly a freedman of Asinius Pollio, who, proconsul of Macedonia, fought against the Parthini in the hinterland of Dyrrachium and celebrated a triumph over that tribe.⁵⁰ The name *Epicadus* is on attestation for local chieftains in the south-eastern tract of the province Dalmatia.⁵¹

Illyrian henchmen of Sulla fit easily into the historical context, so it happens. The enquiry proceeds by way of Marius, it concerns the sources of Plutarch and his methods.

When Marius and Cinna captured Rome, declaring or permitting a massacre, Sertorius alone of their adherents comported himself with decency and

⁴¹ Suet. *DJ* 20.5. Cf. *RE* II, XVI, 1844–50. ⁴² [The *Hecyra*.]

⁴³ *ILS* 5283. ⁴⁴ Plin. *Nat.* 3.143. ⁴⁵ *CIL* 16.100.

⁴⁶ L. Robert, 'Inscriptions et reliefs à Ankara', *Hellenica* 9 (Paris 1950) 67–77, at 72; D. Detschew, *Die thrakischen Sprachreste* (Vienna 1957) 491–2; P. M. Fraser, *Samothece* 2, 1. *The Inscriptions on Stone* (New York 1960) 90.

⁴⁷ *CIL* 10.3387 = *ILS* 2836. ⁴⁸ Suet. *Gramm.* 12; cf. Goetz, *RE* IV, 1311.

⁴⁹ [Suet. *Aug.* 19.1.] ⁵⁰ [Cass. Dio 48.41.7.] ⁵¹ *ILS* 9411–12.

humanity. He conceived annoy[10]ance with Marius, he exhorted Cinna to be moderate. Finally, he dealt with the slaves whom Marius had used in the fighting, and were now the bodyguard of tyranny: guilty of rapine and murder, enriched by Marius and made powerful. They were four thousand in number. Sertorius had them all shot down in their encampment.

So far the *Sertorius*.⁵² The account in the *Marius* is fuller, and in some items more explicit. Marius (it says), designated the slave guardsmen by the name of *Bardyaiei*, and they are mentioned a second time as οἱ καλούμενοι Βαρδυαῖοι. Some of their enormities are described, such as the assassination of Ancharius. In the end they were wiped out. That was done by Cinna, Sertorius, and their friends. In this version, be it noted, Sertorius is not allowed the sole credit, and there is no expatiation of his virtues.

Why Bardyaiei? That tribal designation may derive from the nucleus of Marius' guard, or at least from the members most conspicuous through their behaviour and nationality. Who then are the Bardyaiei? The name (it has been supposed) is corrupt—the reference is to the Vardulli, a people of the Basque country.⁵³ For parallel are adduced various bodyguards of native Spaniards. Thus the Berones, likewise from that region, used by Q. Cassius Longinus, governor of Hispania Ulterior in 48, the Hispani whom Caesar dismissed shortly before the end, or the Calagurritani whom Octavianus kept with him until the War of Actium was finished.⁵⁴

There is no need to range so far afield. The Bardyaiei cannot be anybody but the Vardaei. This was a small remnant of the piratical Ardiaei of old time whom the Romans removed from the Dalmatian coast and sentenced to the pursuit of [11] agriculture on hard and stony territory.⁵⁵ Pliny registers them in the *conventus* of Narona. They had shrunken miserably *populatoresque quondam Italiae Vardaei non amplius quam XX decuriis*.⁵⁶ Their name happens to crop up incidentally in letters exchanged between Cicero and P. Vatinius (*cos.* 47), proconsul of Illyricum in 45. Cicero's literary slave Dionysius had made off with a lot of Cicero's books, he had been seen at Narona, he was reported to have taken refuge among the Vardaei.⁵⁷

Given the bodyguard of Marius styled *Vardaei*, it is no surprise to find persons with Illyrian or Thracian names among the clients of Sulla. According to Appian (the sole authority), Sulla selected his ten thousand from the slaves

⁵² Plut. *Sert.* 43–4.

⁵³ R. Étienne, *Le culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (Paris 1958) 356: 'Varduli'.

⁵⁴ *Bell. Al.* 53.1; Suet. *DJ* 86.1; *Aug.* 49.1.

⁵⁵ Strabo 7.5.6 (315).

⁵⁶ Plin. *Nat.* 3.143: ['the Vardaei, who once were the plunderers of Italy, do not amount to more than twenty *decuriae*']. See C. Patsch, *Historische Wanderungen im Karst und an der Adria. I. Teil. Die Herzegovina einst und jetzt* (Vienna 1922) 41, 53; *RE* s. 2, VIII A1, col. 365.

⁵⁷ Cic. *Fam.* 13.77; cf. 5.9.2.

of people who had been killed.⁵⁸ Not perhaps the only source of loyal or criminal Cornelii, Sulla and his legates conducted operations in 85 on the northern frontier of the province Macedonia. Not only in Thrace, but in Dardania. Before he invaded Italy there may have been another campaign in the direction of Dalmatia.

If Book I of the *Historiae* were extant, Tarula and Scirtus would need no annotation. Links between speeches and narrative are a normal and proper device in historians. Sometimes, as with the better practitioners, small facts are furnished to correct the mendacity of orators or show up their hypocrisy. Such was the procedure of Sallust. At the lowest count, mere elucidation. There ought to have been somewhere in Book I a reference to slave bodyguards of Marius and of Sulla. Perhaps in the prolegomena, dealing with transactions before the narrative proper led off with the consulate of [12] Lepidus and Catulus—that was a long stretch, with much detail, as the fragments prove. Perhaps later, in resumptive comment on Sertorius. The Vardaei of Marius illustrated the excellence of Sertorius, of whom a fragment states *inter arma civilia aequi bonique famas petit*.⁵⁹

Sallust gave a favourable presentation of Q. Sertorius, an energetic man from Nursia in the Sabine country, a declared enemy of Sulla and the oligarchs. Perhaps not all the way. He may also have wished to depict a noble nature perverted, a signal example of decline and fall. It is not legitimate to put to credit, or discredit, of Sallust all the encomiastic language that Plutarch retails in his *Sertorius*. Other sources can be surmised.

The historian, despite prepossessions, was on his guard, as elsewhere when he sought to correct, unobtrusively, the influence of orations already regarded as classical. Sallust is careful to note that Verres, when governor of Sicily, made proper provision for protecting the coasts of Italy against pirates.⁶⁰ Cicero showed up Verres, but the year after defended M. Fonteius, who had been proconsul of Gallia Transalpina, corrupt and oppressive. A fragment of the *Historiae* refers to a province plagued by *vitiosi magistratus*.⁶¹

If the creatures of Sulla were put on show, who could fail to mention the freedman Chrysogonus, secure of infamous immortality through the speech of Cicero defending Sex. Roscius of Ameria? Sallust leaves him out.

⁵⁸ App. BC 1.100.

⁵⁹ Hist. 1.90 M. [= 1.79 McG. 1.78 R.]. Cf. Plut. Sert. 5 and Mar. 44.6.

⁶⁰ Sall. Hist. 4.32 M. [= 28 McG. = 23 R.].

⁶¹ [Sall. Hist. 3.46 M. = 33 McG. = 12 R.]

The Unspeakable Fufidius

[1] After mentioning Tarula and Scirtus, *pessumi servorum*, whom Sulla had enriched, the *Oratio Lepidi* brings up the scandalous advancement of Fufidius—*an quibus praelatus in magistratibus capiundis Fufidius, ancilla turpis, honorum omnium dehonestamentum?*¹

A notorious fellow, this L. Fufidius. He passes into the historical tradition as the man who advised Sulla to put out a proscription list.² Then, praetor in 81, he went out the next year to be governor of Hispania Ulterior. Sertorius defeated him signally at the crossing of the river Baetis.³ No doubt most gratifying for Sallust to narrate.⁴

There was something else to capture the hostile attention of the historian. Orosius designates Fufidius as a *primipilaris*.⁵ Promotions from centurion to senator were a deplorable feature of Sulla's dictatorship, as later under Caesar and the Triumvirs. Sallust in his first monograph duly speaks with distaste of *gregarii milites* who became senators or gained such enrichment as to live like kings.⁶ A note of caution is in place. It is not easy to certify many such senators now or later. As for social origins, the normal centurion rises from the ranks, it is true. But the centurionate could be got through patronage (and even purchase). It is not unlikely that men of respectable or impoverished local families were attracted by the prospect of profit and a career.

Sallust puts Fufidius in high relief with the impressive word *dehonestamentum*. He uses it again to convey an honorable distinction, the maimed eye that afforded Sertorius such manly pride—*quin ille dehonestamento corporis maxime* [2] *laetabatur*.⁷ The subsequent history of the word has no small appeal. No fewer than four instances in Tacitus. One of them evokes Sertorius explicitly. It is Julius Civilis, the Batavian rebel, *Sertorium se aut Hannibalem*

¹ Sall. *Hist.* 1.55.22 M. [= 48.22 McG. = 49.22 R.: 'Or is it those who in seeking magistracies were deemed less worthy than Fufidius, a vile handmaiden, the dishonour of all public offices?'].

² Plut. *Sull.* 31.3; Oros. 5.21.3.

³ [Plut. *Sert.* 12.3–4.]

⁴ Sall. *Hist.* 1.108 M. [= 95 McG. = 95 R.].

⁵ Oros. 5.21.3.

⁶ Sall. *Cat.* 37.6.

⁷ Sall. *Hist.* 1.88 M. [= 77 McG. = 76 R.: 'he took the greatest delight in his physical disfigurement'].

ferens simili oris dehonestamento.⁸ Otherwise the word recurs but sporadically. But nobody should miss a late and paradoxical tribute to the classic historian. The *Historia Augusta*, in cynical invention, produces *Gallus Antipater, ancilla honorum et historicorum dehonestamentum*.⁹

There was another L. Fufidius, the man to whom the great Aemilius Scaurus dedicated his autobiography, those three books *sane utiles, quos nemo legit*, as Cicero describes them in the *Brutus*.¹⁰ More instructive, he adds, than the *Cyropaedia*. Did not the historian take the hint, when working on the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, and read the politician's memoirs, with the kind of attention they demanded?

Some of them supposed the friend of Scaurus identical with the *primipilaris* in Sulla's army. That notion can be dismissed. A passage in the *Naturalis Historia* of Pliny mentions him in a group of praetorian senators who persisted in wearing the iron ring to the end of their days.¹¹ An earlier generation is clearly indicated: one of them is a Manilius, or rather Manlius, a legate of Marius.

Yet they might belong to one and the same family, those Fufidii having chosen to revert to the equestrian station (from bad luck or good sense). Observe, for example, M. Seius L. f. (*aed. cur.* 74), whose son M. Seius M. f. is a wealthy man of affairs.¹²

Fufidii are on show at Arpinum and in the vicinity of [3] Cicero. Q. Fufidius Q. f., an excellent and cultivated man, served under him in Cilicia as a military tribune.¹³ An inscription reveals M. Fufidius M. f. as *aedilis* at Arpinum.¹⁴ This Fufidius is perhaps to be discovered in the corrupt name of a man whom Cicero commended to the proconsul of Gaul in 46.¹⁵ But other names enter into the court.

However that may be, there is the Fufidius from whom Cicero bought land at Arpinum in 54, and who, dying in 47, bequeathed Cicero a legacy. This will be the *eques Romanus, homo ornatissimus*¹⁶ who was so abominably treated by L. Piso in the province of Macedonia—the proconsul scaled down debts owed to Fufidius by the city of Apollonia.¹⁷ It is therefore tempting and natural to equate him with Fufidius, the rapacious banker in Horace, *dives agris, dives positus in faenore nummis*.¹⁸

⁸ [Tac. *Hist.* 4.13.3: 'he conducted himself like a Sertorius and a Hannibal, since his face was disfigured like theirs'.]

⁹ HA *Claud.* 5.4 ['Gallus Antipater, the handmaiden of honours and the dishonour of historians'].

¹⁰ [Cic. *Brut.* 112.]

¹¹ Plin. *Nat.* 33.21. Cf. Sall. *Hist.* 1.55 M. [= 48 McG. = 49 R.].

¹² Münzer, *RE* II, 3, 1121, no. 3–4.

¹³ Cic. *Fam.* 13.11.12.

¹⁴ *CIL* 1².1537 = *ILS* 5738.

¹⁵ Cic. *Fam.* 7.5.2; cf. Münzer, *RE* XIII, 202, no. 5. Shackleton-Bailey has M. <Cur>tius [see Cicero: *Epistulae ad Familiares*, I (Cambridge 1977) 329–30; the option *Fufidius* is not even considered].

¹⁶ Cic. *Q. f.* 3.1.3.

¹⁷ Cic. *Pis.* 86.

¹⁸ Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.13 ['rich in lands, rich in moneys loaned at usury'].

It is easy, too easy perhaps, to concentrate all these Fufidii of Arpinum, from Scaurus' friend the senator down to the banker. Other towns of Italy can yield Fufidii.¹⁹ However, no Fufidius of consequence can be detected before the middle of the second century, when a whole cluster emerges, all from the same place, Saepinum in Samnium.²⁰

¹⁹ Puteoli (*CIL* 10.1781), Carsulae (*CIL* 11.4595), Teanum (*CIL* 10.4805).

²⁰ *PIR*² F 204–6, nos. 500–7. [Cf. *CIL* 9.2450–3; *AE* 1978, 288–9.]

Rex Leptasta (Hist. II, 20)

[1] Sertorius was seized by a longing to go to the Fortunate Isles, but his allies, the Cilician Pirates, would have none of it. They left him and went to Mauretania, there espousing the cause of a native prince called Ascalis, the son of Ipthas. Sertorius came after them and intervened with effect on the other side: he laid siege to the city of Tingi which Ascalis was holding. Further, he defeated a certain Paccianus, or rather Paciaecus, whom Sulla had sent with troops to defend Ascalis. Paciaecus fell in battle, and Sertorius was able to capture Tingi. Then, after reinstating the adversaries of Ascalis in possession and rule, he departed, a call having come from the Lusitanians, who admired his fame and virtues.

So far Plutarch, deriving from the *Histories* of Sallust.¹ His narrative has nothing to add about the fate of Ascalis, and no other source knows that name. Is Ascalis merely a local dynast, or should he be inserted into the line of the rulers of Mauretania? That kingdom, a unit under Bocchus, split into two parts, perhaps on his decease. Eastern Mauretania was held by Bogud, who at the time of these transactions gave help to Pompeius in his rapid conquest of Numidia; the western region, it is suggested, was ruled in succession by Ipthas, by Ascalis, and by that Bogud who is attested between 49 and 31.² A further step has been taken, not quite legitimately: Bogud was a son of Ascalis.³

A fragment of the *Historiae* will have to be taken into account. It alludes to a person who had been sent out of Mauretania under custody by a prince called Leptasta—*quem ex Mauritanis rex Leptasta proditiōnis insimulatum cum custodibus miserat* [2.20: ‘whom King Leptasta had sent in custody from Mauretania under a charge of treachery’].

What is the date of this episode? It cannot be referred to the adventures of Sertorius in Mauretania, for they took place in 81 or early in 80, and were recorded in Book I. It should belong a few years later, about 76, and be relevant

[1] ¹ Plut. *Sert.* 9–10.

² S. Gsell, *Histoire ancienne de l’Afrique du Nord* VII (Paris 1930) 274.

³ Cf. the stemma provided by J. Mazard, *Corpus Nummorum Numidiae Mauretaniaeque* (Paris 1955) 60.

about relations between a Mauretanian prince and one of the Roman commanders operating in Spain, perhaps Pompeius.⁴

[2] The name 'Leptasta' has come under scrutiny. It lacks parallel; it looks like a corruption of the native name Iepis, which happens to be attested on inscriptions of Numidia.⁵ Further, Iepis might be the same as Ipthes which Plutarch assigns to the parent of the Mauretanian Ascalis. The persons are conceivably the same. Not necessarily, however. The 'Leptasta' of Sallust might be another person, yet a member of the same family, perhaps a grandson of Ipthas. Ascalis (so Plutarch reports) had his brothers with him when besieged at Tingi.⁶

* * *

There the matter might rest—no solution possible, no illumination anywhere. But there is extant in Valerius Maximus a remarkable passage that seems to have been ignored by those whose concern and duty it is to register the princes of Mauretania, to elucidate *rex Leptasta*, or to enumerate the persons named 'Paciaecus'.

That author attests a Paciaecus who had been killed by a tribal chieftain called Etpastus. He ecstatically praises the valour and piety of two brothers, Spaniards of low estate who had been hired by the Paciaeci for a desperate venture in which they earned their pay and, though perishing, died like brave men and ensured for their parents ease and comfort in old age. They were used by the Paciaeci to take vengeance on Etpastus—a *Paciaecis pacti ut eorum patris interfectorem Etpastum, gentis suae tyrannum, occideretis*.⁷

Valerius Maximus mentions the Paciaeci without specification, as though he was well aware who they might be. Posterity could have been baffled, but not the contemporaries of Sulla and Caesar, at least: the Paciaeci are a notable family in Hispania Ulterior, of Italian and immigrant extraction. Who then was the Etpastus who had been responsible for the killing of a Paciaecus? Not, surely, the chieftain of some Spanish tribe.⁸ The name is unattested elsewhere, and inexplicable. Is it not corrupt? It may well be the same as 'Ipthas' or 'Leptasta', attested for rulers of Mauretania. The evidence about Paciaeci may furnish a clue, though no certainty.

* * *

⁴ Cf. the comments of Maurenbrecher, *ad loc.*

⁵ S. Gsell, *Inscriptions latines de l'Algérie* I (Paris 1922) 735; 1581–2; cf. Gsell, *Histoire* 271–2. Gsell suggests that Leptasta might have been the same person as Ipthas, the parent of Ascalis.

⁶ Plut. *Sert.* 9.

⁷ Val. Max. 5.4, ext. 3: ['you made a deal with the Paciaeci to kill their father's murderer Etpastus, tyrant of his people']. The mss. exhibit variants, such as *ecpasto* and *etpasti*, which furnish no clue. Etpastus is absent from *RE*, and the article on the Paciaeci has missed this reference.

⁸ As Kempfs, in the index of his second edition (1887).

[3] Several Paciaeci can be distinguished—the orthography of their highly peculiar name tends to be corrupted in Greek sources but is clearly reproduced in several Latin writers.⁹

First, Vibius Paciaecus, a property-holder with estates in Spain on the coast. M. Crassus sought refuge in that country in 85 (he knew it, for he had been there with his father (*cos.* 97), who had been proconsul of Hispania Ulterior). He went to a large cave for hiding-place. Vibius Paciaecus amiably supplied comfort and commodities for his sojourn (a pair of attractive hand-maidens happen to be registered).¹⁰ After a retreat of eight months, Crassus sallied forth, gathered partisans, and made visitations on several cities. It was alleged that he sacked Malaca.¹¹ The charge may be false (Crassus denied it), but the geographical indication is precious. The Paciaeci can thus be localised on the southern shore of Spain, facing Mauretania: not perhaps territorial magnates only but commercial, for this is the tract famous for salted fish and fish pickle; and the ancient settlement of Macnace (near Malaca) was a market for the natives across the water, so Strabo attests.¹²

Next, in the same period (and perhaps the same person), the Paciaecus despatched to Mauretania, who perished near Tingi, fighting for Ascalis the son of Ipthas.¹³

Then, a generation later, two Paciaeci crop up. A certain C. Paciaecus was one of the captives of Carrhae. The Parthians, staging a parody of a Roman triumphal ceremony, chose him to impersonate Crassus for he bore the closest personal resemblance to the proconsul.¹⁴ Their choice should imply that he was more or less of the age of that sexagenarian.

It was not fanciful to suppose that Caesar inherited something of Crassus' *clientela* in the Peninsula.¹⁵ A Caesarian Paciaecus stands on clear record. Two letters of Cicero reveal him. Early in 46 rumours were current, but no certainty, about the first stage of Caesar's invasion of Africa; the elder son of Pompeius Magnus had not shown up to Africa, nor, on the testimony of Paciaecus, had he been in the Balearic Islands.¹⁶

[2] ⁹ Cf. F. Münzer, *RE* XVIII, 2061–2. The editors of Plutarch, Lindskog, and Ziegler, unfortunately lacked the courage to print Πακιαϊκός, though the manuscript variants in their apparatus (*Sert.* 9; *Crass.* 4 and 32) are sufficient to justify that reading.

¹⁰ *Crassus* 4–5. Lindskog-Ziegler print his name as Ἰουβίου Σπαρκιακοῦ. Their index has Οὐβίος Πακιανός.

¹¹ *Crassus* 6.

¹² Strabo III, p. 156.

¹³ *Sertorius* 9. Mommsen divines that this Πακιανός was a Pacciaecus, *Römische Geschichte* III (Berlin 1920) 20. He did not convince Schulten who wrote 'aber Paccianus ist ein auch sonst bekannter Name (Plut. *Crass.* 32)', *Sertorius* (Leipzig 1926) 52. Ironically, that Paccianus is likewise [3] to be recognised as a Paciaecus. Broughton registers the man sent to Mauretania in 81 as 'Paccianus' (*MRR* II, 78).

¹⁴ *Crassus* 32, cf. Münzer, *RE* XVIII, 2062.

¹⁵ Cf. Syme, *RR* 75.

¹⁶ Cic. *Att.* 12.2.1. Inadvertently assigned by Münzer to the following year, and cited by him after Cic. *Fam.* 6.18.2 [*RE* XVIII, 2061].

[4] In January of the next year despatches from Paciaecus (a copy was sent by Caesar to his agents at Rome) certified the Pompeian strength in Spain as eleven legions.¹⁷ This is the man who is mentioned in the *Bellum Hispaniense*. One of Caesar's first actions when he reached Hispania Ulterior was to send Paciaecus with a force to relieve the city of Ulia—*quibus praefecit hominem eius provinciae notum et non parum scientem, L. Vibium Paciaecum*.¹⁸

The Paciaeci (it is stated and patent) are a notable family of Hispania Ulterior. The form and nature of their name demand scrutiny. Strange as it may seem, 'Paciaecus' is a *nomen*, not a *cognomen*. That is proved by the nomenclature of a freedman attested by four inscriptions at Rome, 'T. Paciaecus T. l. Isargyrus': two have the form 'Pacciaccus', two 'Paciaecus'.¹⁹ Now the man who harboured M. Crassus is designated as 'Vibius Paciaecus'.²⁰ On first view, 'Vibius' looks like a *nomen*. It will be advantageous to recall that 'Vibius' is also an Oscan *praenomen*. Thus the Vibius Curius who led cavalry for Caesar in the invasion of Italy;²¹ and conjecture can establish Vibia Aurunculeia as the name of the bride in a poem of Catullus.²² Hence there is a chance that the author of the *Bellum Hispaniense* or a scribe is in error when registering the Caesarian partisan as 'L. Vibius Paciaecus'.

'Paciaecus' is therefore to be recognised as *gentilicium*, peculiar though it be. A weighty authority on these matters suggests that the termination may be Iberian.²³ That is not necessary. The stem of the word is patently Oscan ('Pacius', 'Paccius', 'Paquius').²⁴ Moreover, none of the notables of Southern Spain, whatever may be their extraction, show native elements in their nomenclature. If that onomatological jungle, the back-country of Italy, can exhibit specimens like 'Avidiacus', 'Venaccius', or 'Pataecius', why boggle at 'Paciaecus'?²⁵

Evidence thus accrues to illuminate the immigration of Italians into Spain. That is a topic of vital importance, but commonly neglected. The main clues are 'Annaeus', 'Ulpus', and 'Dasumius'—the ancestors of the historic personages who bore those names were Italian soldiers in the early days or small traders.²⁶

* * *

¹⁷ Cic. *Fam.* 6.18.2. ¹⁸ *Bell. Hisp.* 3.4.

¹⁹ *CIL* 6.33289–90 (*Pacciaecus*); 33291 and 33325 (*Paciaecus*).

²⁰ Plut. *Crass.* 4. ²¹ *Caes. BC* 1.24.3.

²² Cat. 61.16 (*Iunia*), 32–3 (*Aurunculeia*). The conjecture *Vibia* was taken over by C. L. Neudling, *A Prosopography to Catullus* (Oxford 1955) 185; and it is registered in the apparatus of the text of R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford 1958).

[4] ²³ W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin 1904) 28, followed by Münzer, *RE* XVIII, 2061. Münzer says 'der einzige römische Gentilname der in seiner Bildung echt iberisch zu sein scheint'. He goes on, however, to state that 'Paciaecus' is only attested as a *cognomen* in the written sources.

²⁴ Cf., briefly, E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae* (Oxford 1958) 308.

²⁵ *Avidiacus*, *CIL* 9.3429; 3500 (Peltuinum, in the Paelignian country); *Venaecius*, 2806 (Aufidena); cf. *Venecius* in the nomenclature of a senatorial family from Attidium in Umbria (*CIL* 11.5672); *Pataccius*, not in *LE*, but observe the procurator L. Venuleius Pataccius (*AE* 1936, 1: Ilium).

²⁶ Cf. R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 590, 784–6.

The Paciaeci, established somewhere in the vicinity of Malaca, were involved in transactions across the water, as witness the man who was sent to help Ascalis. Indeed, involved more than once, if it is safe to invoke Valerius Maximus and identify 'Etpastus' as a Mauretanian prince who killed a member of that family.

The first Paciaecus known to history, namely the friend of Crassus, fell in battle near Tingi. Hardly therefore the Paciaecus killed by the dynast 'Etpastus' (i.e., perhaps Leptas or Leptasta). That episode may belong a few years later, the victim being another member of the family. In that case, the sons who avenged him might be identified—the man who later went with Crassus to Mesopotamia, and the Caesarian partisan active in 46 and 45.

Sallust (it will be recalled), mentions a Mauretanian prince called Leptasta: he arrested a man and sent him out of Mauretania on a charge of treachery. The episode may fall about 76—and the man in question might be the Paciaecus for whose death Etpastus was held responsible by his sons.

That is to say, a Paciaecus may have occurred in the context of the fragment that names *rex Leptasta* (*Hist.* 2.20 [= 2.93 McGushin = 2.88 Ramsey]). Sallust might also be the source of the story about 'Etpastus' and the heroic assassins in Valerius Maximus. That author may elsewhere be drawing on Sallust for anecdotes of the Sertorian period.

* * *

There are other possibilities. The story excites the enthusiasm of Valerius Maximus. It also seems to disclose a special familiarity. He mentions the Paciaeci without any explanation, as though he knew who they were, and he can refer to a monument that commemorated the *pietas* of the Spanish brothers—*itaque tumulis etiam nunc vivitis!* [5.4.ext.3: 'so even now you live by your tombs!'] [6] This author is prone to declamation and exclamation, it is true, but he is not in the habit of apostrophising his characters unless they be as notable as Cato, Cato's daughter, Divus Julius, or Aelius Seianus.²⁷ Had he seen the monument—or was he himself one of the Romans from Spain? Valerius Maximus nowhere discloses any hint about his own town or province—and the topic has failed to tempt speculation. His nomenclature is of that indistinctive yet revealing type that often goes with native extraction ultimately: compare M. Fabius Quintilianus, M. Valerius Martialis (from Calaguris and Bilbilis respectively).

Before that notion be admitted, another writer comes into play. Valerius Maximus, compiling his collection of edificatory excerpts, went to various authors. Among his sources may have been Fenestella, himself a collector with an affection for odd items of social history, not that any passage of Valerius can be shown thence derived.²⁸

²⁷ Val. Max. 3.2.14; 4.6.5; 1.6.13; 9.11, ext. 4.

[5] ²⁸ Few have canvassed the question, and R. Helm affirms that no traces of Fenestella can be detected (*RE* VIII A, 108).

But Fenestella is relevant to Spain and the Paciaeci. Fenestella (so Plutarch reports) had met an old lady who liked telling him all about Crassus' sojourn in the cave: she was one of the two females so amiably provided by Vibius Paciaecus.²⁹ Fenestella is plainly the ultimate source for the whole story about Crassus—and welcome for those who gather fragments of Fenestella.³⁰

The name 'Fenestella' is rare and Etruscan, suitably attested by a L. Papirius Fenestella at Clusium.³¹ It can also be discovered in Spain, though nowhere near Malaca and the Paciaeci. Coins of the Augustan period reveal two local magistrates in towns in the valley of the Ebro, namely 'L. Feneste(IIa)' at the *municipium* of Turiaso, 'C. Valerius Fenest(ella)' at the colony of Caesaraugusta.³² Some are bold enough to suggest that the man at Turiaso may be no other than the historian.³³ Caution is prescribed. Turiaso lies some distance in the back-country, about halfway between Caesaraugusta and Numantia. In origin a native or mixed town, it was elevated to the rank of a *municipium*, perhaps as late as 28 BC.³⁴

[7] Fenestella's age may be relevant, if it could with precision be established. The *Chronicle* of Jerome states that he died at Cumae in AD 19, aged seventy.³⁵ The date, like others in that document, has no special sanctity—and it has been contested. According to the Elder Pliny, Fenestella died towards the end of the reign of Tiberius.³⁶ Perhaps there is an error in Jerome—Fenestella was born in 35 BC, not in 52 BC (each of those years had a Pompeius for consul).³⁷ However that may be, no obstacle of chronology precludes the guess that Valerius Maximus got his story about the Paciaeci from Fenestella. He was writing in the period 28–31, and by singular good luck his loyal zeal was able to shove in a denunciation of Aelius Seianus, who was destroyed on October 18, 31.³⁸

²⁹ Plut. *Crass.* 5: τούτων φησὶ τὴν ἑτέραν ἤδη πρεσβύτιν οὖσαν ὁ Φενεστέλλας ἰδεῖν αὐτόν, καὶ πολλάκις ἀκοῦσαι μεμνημένης ταῦτα καὶ διεξιούσης προθύμως ['Fenestella says that he saw one of these slaves himself—she was by then an old woman—and often heard her recall this episode and rehearse its details with gusto'.]

³⁰ Hence H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum reliquiae* II (Leipzig 1906) fr. 15.

³¹ *Corpus inscriptionum Etruscarum* 675 = CIL 11.2144 (Clusium), cited in Schulze, *Zur Geschichte*, 356.

³² G. F. Hill, *Notes on the Ancient Coinage of Hispania Citerior* (New York 1931) 166, 88.

³³ M. Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas* (Cambridge 1946) 169: 'the duovir L. Fenestella may well be the historian, whose wife was certainly Spanish'. He refers to Wissowa, *RE* VI, 2177—but this is only a patent misconception about Wissowa's allusion to the woman in Plut. *Crass.* 4 ('eine Frau').

[6] ³⁴ Grant, *From Imperium*, 168. ³⁵ Jerome, p. 147 Schöne [= p. 172 Helm].

³⁶ Plin. *Nat.* 33.146: *Fenestella, qui obiit novissimo Tiberii Caesaris principatu* ('Fenestella, who died in the last years of the principate of Tiberius Caesar').

³⁷ On this problem see F. Münzer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius* (Berlin 1897) 345–6; H. Peter, *HRR* I (Leipzig 1906) CVI–VII; Wissowa, *RE* VI, 2177.

³⁸ Val. Max. 9.11, Ext. 4: *tu videlicet offuscae barbariae immanitate truculentius*, etc.

Sallust and Bestia

[1] The standard and received opinion postulates two coevals, each bearing the identical nomenclatures of ‘L. Calpurnius Bestia’: viz., the tribune of the plebs in 62 BC and the man whom Cicero defended in February of 56.¹ Doubts have been voiced by scholars from time to time, but no reasoned denial stands on record so far, or any systematic refutation.² It may be worth the effort to establish the fact that only one Bestia is known and named in this epoch. The enquiry, while clarifying sundry public transactions between 63 and 43, will set forth the chequered career of an individual on the fringe of great affairs. More important, the conclusion may have something to tell about the methods of the historian Sallust; it might even have a bearing on the date of his first monograph.

* * *

If credence is to be given to Sallust, Bestia belonged to the original nucleus and membership of the great conspiracy. His name is registered, one of the eleven senators who, along with four Roman knights and a company of anonymous adherents, were convoked by Catilina in the summer of 64 and stimulated by a fervid and revolutionary address.³

That is not all—and not the worst. Sallust reports the plan of action contrived by Lentulus Sura and other leaders of the conspiracy in November or very early in December of 63, after Catilina had left Rome to muster troops in Etruria. The tribune Bestia (so Sallust asseverates) was to deliver a harangue before the People, blaming Cicero for what had happened so far. That was the agreed signal. In the evening the other conspirators would proceed to carry out the tasks they had been assigned—fires at twelve points in the city, Cethegus assassinating the consul, and so on.⁴

¹ Münzer, *RE* III, 1367; Gelzer, *RE* VI A, 935; Broughton *MRR* II, 174, 189, 201, cf. the Index.

² Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms* II² (Leipzig 1902), 79–80 registers them separately, but a footnote admits that they may be the same person; and identity ‘seems most probable’ to R. G. Austin in his edition of *Pro Caelio* (Oxford 1952²) 154. Syme, reviewing *MRR*, has ‘surely identical’ (*CP* 50 [1955] 134).

³ Sall. *Cat.* 17.3.

⁴ Sall. *Cat.* 43.1: *constituerant uti cum Catilina in agrum Faesulanum (Aefulanum, Ranchenstein) cum exercitu venisset, L. Bestia tribunus plebis contione habita quereretur de*

In spite of these explicit allegations, Bestia lapses from the narration. Sallust enjoys the reputation of a careful, artful, and economical writer. It is not his habit to bring in named persons [2] without point or reason. Curiosity asks (and must have asked) what happened to Bestia in the sequel: was he apprehended along with the other prominent Catilinarians on 5 December, or did he escape and join his leader, to fall in battle bravely at Pistoriae? Nothing is disclosed by Sallust. No other source for the conspiracy puts Bestia in such high relief, or even records his participation, save only Appian, whose account (it is clear) derives ultimately from Sallust.⁵

The outbreak mentioned by Sallust may have been planned for the day on which the new tribunes entered on office, namely December 10. Other evidence points to the eve of the *Saturnalia* (that festival began on December 17).⁶ Perhaps there was a postponement (as happens in conspiracies genuine or alleged). That need not matter. Events took a different turn, abolishing those dates and designs. The intrigue with the Allobroges gave Cicero his chance: the conspirators were denounced, arraigned, and destroyed on the glorious Fifth of December.

None the less, and by an ostensible paradox, the tribune L. Calpurnius Bestia was not to be denied a harangue soon after entering on office, an invective against Cicero. Along with Metellus Nepos (sent back from the eastern lands by Pompeius Magnus), Bestia made a savage attack on the consul who had executed Roman citizens; on the last day of the year they prevented Cicero from delivering an oration before the People in defence and glorification of what he had done.⁷

Various associates of Catilina were impugned or condemned in the aftermath. Cicero, speaking as the advocate of P. Sulla in 62, registers several names. Nobody of station or repute, he says, would have thought of undertaking the defence of these people.⁸ There is no hint of Bestia in this context. Elsewhere in that oration occurs an allusion (no name). It carries an imputation that the person is really one of the Catilinarians—he is a tribune

actionibus Ciceronis bellique gravissimi invidiam optumo consuli imponderet; eo signo proxima nocte cetera multitudo coniurationis suum quisque negotium exsequeretur, etc. [‘they had decided that, after Catilina’s arrival in the territory of Faesulae with the army, the tribune of the plebs L. Bestia should hold a meeting, complain about the actions of Cicero and saddle the best of consuls with the resentment for the gravest of wars: at that signal, on the following night the crowd of the conspirators should carry out their own individual tasks...’].

⁵ App. BC 2.3. ⁶ Cic. Cat. 3.10; cf. Plut. Cic. 18.

[2] ⁷ Plut. Cic. 23 (the only source to mention Bestia by name). Nepos commands greater prominence, for various reasons (Cic. Fam. 5.9.7; Cass. Dio 37.38.2, etc.); for the full evidence, Gelzer, *RE* VI A, 891–2. It should be added that Nepos had already been attacking Cicero before the end of November (*Mur.* 81—no name but identity clear).

⁸ Cic. Sull. 6–7.

who had the bad taste to deplore their fate.⁹ Further, the speech in defence of Sestius six [3] years later carried an unfriendly and anonymous reference to the actions of tribunes in the last days of Cicero's consulate.¹⁰ Annotating both items, the *Scholia Bobiensia* correctly divine an allusion to Bestia.¹¹

Cicero conceived and expressed bitter resentment against the tribunes who in December of the year 63 abused his conduct and disputed his salvation of the State. But Cicero was not able or willing to incriminate Bestia and show him up as a conspirator.

Nor was anybody else. For the moment (it is true) his tribunate was a shield. This objectionable person survived and prospered, however. It would be worth knowing who were his friends, allies, or protectors. Speculation, invoking later events, might make play with the names of P. Clodius Pulcher and M. Antonius.

Continuing in the career of honours unmolested, Bestia became aedile, as later emerges.¹² That office might be put without discomfort in the year 59.¹³

The next notice about Bestia is casual, and not of any great significance. In 57, when the tribune Sestius, maltreated by the bands of Clodius in an affray near the Temple of Castor, was left for dead, he was rescued by Bestia: Cicero later exploited the incident.¹⁴ More to the point, Bestia was a candidate for the praetorship in this year, supported, for a time at least, by M. Caelius Rufus.¹⁵ He failed at the polls¹⁶—and soon encountered peril.

Early in 56 Bestia had to face a prosecution for *ambitus*. It was a classic case in the annals of Roman eloquence and remembered for long ages.¹⁷ The prosecutor was none other than Caelius Rufus, the vigorous young orator first brought into public fame by his indictment of C. Antonius (*cos.* 63), the proconsul of Macedonia, three years previously.¹⁸ Bestia was defended by Cicero, in more orations than one.¹⁹ In a letter to his brother, the orator happens to allude to a speech delivered on February 11.²⁰

[4] The prosecution of Bestia provoked a quick *riposte*, and indeed revenge. In April Caelius himself was on trial *de vi*, among the advocates for the defence

⁹ Cic. *Sull.* 31: *quod cum is tribunus pl. facit qui unus videtur ex illis ad lugendos coniuratos relictus, nemini mirum est* ['which is not, indeed, strange to anyone, when it is done by that tribune who seem to be the only one left to mourn the conspirators'].

¹⁰ Cic. *Sest.* 11.

¹¹ Ed. Hildebrandt (1907), p. 15 (Bestia, or perhaps Nepos); p. 85 (Bestia and Nepos).

¹² Cic. *Phil.* 13.26.

¹³ *MRR*, unfortunately using the same piece of evidence twice, has a L. Calpurnius Bestia as conjectural aedile both in 59 and in 57.

[3] ¹⁴ *Ad Q. Fr.* 2.3.6, cf. *Sest.* 72.

¹⁵ Cic. *Cael.* 26.

¹⁶ Cic. *Phil.* 11.11.

¹⁷ Tac. *Dial.* 39.5.

¹⁸ Cf. H. Malcovati, *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta* (Turin 1955²) 480–9, no. 162.

¹⁹ Cic. *Phil.* 11.11: *at hic me defendente quinquies absolutus est* ['And this man was acquitted on five occasions with me as his defence attorney']. Cf. 13.26: *corycus laterum et vocis meae Bestia* ['Bestia, the sandbag of my lungs and my voice'].

²⁰ *Ad Q. Fr.* 2.3.6.

being the alert, pliant, and unprejudiced Cicero. The name of Bestia crops up once, and once only, in Cicero's oration, unexplained, and at first sight enigmatic.²¹ The audience was not at a loss. They knew the personalities involved, the relationships, and the background of the case.

In his exordium, Cicero names the prosecutor. He is Atratinus, a young man, *humanissimus atque optimus adulescens*.²² His identity offers no problem—he is patently L. Sempronius Atratinus. His parent, referred to in the speech but not named, was indebted to Cicero for a *beneficium*.²³ A senior Sempronius Atratinus is not on record among the clients defended by Cicero, whereas an inscription designates the younger Atratinus as the son of a Bestia.²⁴ Everything becomes clear: Bestia's son will have been adopted by a Sempronius Atratinus (unattested).

Bestia's son, escaping record for long years (from 56 to 40) emerges as an admiral of Marcus Antonius and reaches a suffect consulate in 34.²⁵ His sister was married to another Antonian partisan, viz. L. Gellius Poplicola, consul in 36.²⁶

As for Bestia, despite the assiduous and heroic efforts of Cicero, he succumbed to prosecution in the end. As the orator was careful to explain thirteen years later, Bestia's advocate had been unimpeachable. He performed his task *fide optima*, but the jury knew their manifest duty.²⁷

A long silence now envelops the name of L. Calpurnius Bestia. He is next to be discovered (so it seems) in the Calpurnius whom Antonius in a letter addressed to Cicero early in 49 described as *familiarissimus meus*.²⁸

Caesar brought back to public life a number of *homines calamitosi*, the victims of Roman justice, among them not a few who had once been defended by Cicero.²⁹ Bestia can be added to that category which [5] is conveniently designated by Cicero as the *honeste condemnati, turpiter restituti*.³⁰

Bestia is the last known survivor of the tribunes of 62. In 52 three tribunes earned a hazardous notoriety through turbulent speeches attacking Milo and his champions, namely C. Sallustius Crispus, Q. Pompeius Rufus, and T. Munatius Plancus Bursa. Indeed, Sallust and Rufus are the *abiecti homines ac perditi* who called Cicero a brigand and assassin.³¹ Rufus and Plancus were indicted and condemned, but Sallust, more lucky or more astute, was not then

²¹ Cic. *Cael.* 26 ['a most humane and excellent young man'].

²² Cic. *Cael.* 1. ²³ Cic. *Cael.* 7.

²⁴ ILS 9461 (Hypata in Thessaly). Münzer drew the conclusion in his study of Caelius ('Aus dem Leben des M. Caelius Rufus', *Hermes* 44 [1909] 135–44 [= KS, 83–90]), and it is universally accepted, though strangely ignored by Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*⁴ (Munich 1927) 399, 431. For a clear statement, R. G. Austin, *o. c.*, 152–5.

²⁵ Münzer, *RE* IIA, 1366–[68, no. 26]; Syme, *RR* 269; Broughton, *MRR* II, 385, 389 etc.

²⁶ *IG* II² 4330 (Athens), 4381 (Eleusis). See n. 96, below. [4] ²⁷ Cic. *Phil.* 11.11.

²⁸ Cic. *Att.* 10.8a.2. ²⁹ Syme, *RR* 81.

³⁰ Cic. *Phil.* 11.12: ['honourably convicted, shamefully rehabilitated'].

³¹ Cic. *Mil.* 47; cf. Asc. 49.22.

molested (so far as known). He was expelled from the Senate in 50 by the censor Ap. Claudius Pulcher.

Sallust commanded troops for Caesar, became praetor, governed a province—and lost his patron's favour through extortion committed in that province. Rufus died shortly before the outbreak of the Civil War, but Plancus was rehabilitated by Caesar; he held some function or other at *ludi triumphales* in the autumn of 46.³² As for Bestia, no evidence shows that he had any honour or employment from the Dictator—perhaps he was outstripped by more recent careerists and younger men. Bestia is next found in the camp and following of Antonius at the siege of Mutina early in 43. Like Plancus, who was also of that company, Plancus 'who would not have burned down the Curia if he cherished the Senate',³³ Bestia was an easy target for sarcasm. Bestia (so Cicero asserts) was staking out a claim for the consulate in the place of D. Brutus, though he had never been praetor: with what justice unless he deemed condemnation in the courts as good as a praetorship?³⁴

This conjuncture brought Bestia into publicity and comment, evoking sundry events of twenty years before (about which Cicero kept silent in the *Philippics*). The first repercussion is clear and sharp. In May or June of 43 M. Brutus wrote an angry letter to Atticus. He made complaint about Cicero who, among other things, had spoken ill of Servilius Casca from deference to Octavian. Cicero (says Brutus) when he denounces Casca as an assassin is imitating the language Bestia used about himself.³⁵ Brutus goes on to mention the way in which Bestia (and [6] Clodius too) were wont to attack Cicero's conduct in his consulate.

The second repercussion may perhaps be detected in Sallust's monograph. The author not merely enrolls Bestia among the foundation-members of Catilina's conspiracy: he comes out with the allegation that a speech from the tribune Bestia was to be the sign and signal for desperate actions.

Sallust's presentation of Bestia ought to have excited a lively curiosity. Is it honest, is it accurate—and was Bestia still alive when Sallust was composing the *Bellum Catilinae*?³⁶

The Ides of March and various events in the sequel drew attention to early and questionable episodes in Caesar's career. Cicero was prompted to take up again the secret history of his own times, the work *De consiliis suis*.³⁷ The

³² Cic. *Fam.* 12.18.2. ³³ Cic. *Phil.* 13.27.

³⁴ Cic. *Phil.* 11.11. ³⁵ *Ad M. Brutum* 1.17.1.

³⁶ These problems and perspectives were missed by scholars who assumed without proper inspection of the evidence that there were two persons called 'L. Calpurnius Bestia'—and who consequently failed to see that this Bestia whose name aroused attention in 43 (Cic. *Phil.* 11.11; 13.26) was none other than the tribune signalled ever after by his anti-Ciceronian harangues of December, 62 (cf., in this same year, Brutus to Atticus, *Ad M. Brutum* 1.17.1).

[5] ³⁷ Cic. *Att.* 14.17.6 (2 May 44); 16.11.3–4 (5 November). It is permissible to equate this work with the *Anekdotia* (Cic. *Att.* 2.6.2) which Cicero left to be published by his son (Cass. Dio 39.10.2–3). Cf. E. Schwartz, 'Die Berichte über die catilinarische Verschwörung', *Hermes* 32 (1897), 554–608, at 557–9 = *Gesammelte Schriften* II (Berlin 1956) 275–336, at 279–80.

Bellum Catilinae also reflects the keen interest now awakened—not that the monograph needs to be regarded primarily as a challenge to the *De consiliis suis* or a loyal Caesarian's artful device to exculpate Caesar of any complicity in Catilinarian activities.³⁸ Nor indeed is it safe to assume that the historian Sallust was a loyal Caesarian.

The large figures in history or the lesser, their death brought old stories into currency again, permitting all manner of comment and allegation. Bestia may have perished in the War of Mutina, or soon after: would Sallust in these dangerous days have wished to provoke the enmity of a partisan influential enough with Antonius to conceive hopes of the consulate?

That consideration touches the date of the *Bellum Catilinae*. There is no sign how soon Sallust went to work after the death of Caesar—or rather, perhaps, after the death of Cicero. He might not have completed the work before the War of Perusia (41/40).³⁹ However that may be, it can be claimed that Sallust was persuaded to put Bestia among the Catilinarians because of his emergence in 43—and further, perhaps, because of his recent decease.

The monograph betrays a number of disturbing anachronisms in the placing of events. Where are the reasons to be sought—inadvertence, deceit, or artistic devices? The question is variously [7] answered, according to the view scholars take of Sallust's personality, his purpose in writing, and his political bias.⁴⁰

The most flagrant piece of antedating is the allocution of Catilina to his associates in the summer of 64, before the consular elections.⁴¹ It announces a programme of revolution. But that programme, and the plot (it should be clear enough), develop only as a result of Catilina's failure to be elected consul the year after.

A minor item can be instructive. The woman Fulvia, passing on information derived from her lover, Q. Curius, was able to warn Cicero of the plot to assassinate him early in the morning of November 7.⁴² If Sallust is to be believed, she had been in touch with Cicero from the first days of his consulship.⁴³ So far so good. But Fulvia and Curius are inserted into the narrative at an earlier point still. They are there in 64, after the meeting of the conspirators at Catilina's house. Fulvia is already talking, she tells people *de Catilinae conspiratione*, suppressing, however, the name of Curius.⁴⁴

³⁸ For a temperate and balanced statement see H. M. Last, 'Sallust and Caesar in the *Bellum Catilinae*', in *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à J. Marouzeau* (Paris 1948) 355–69.

³⁹ H. M. Last suggests that it was finished, at the latest, soon after the beginning of 42 BC ('Sallust and Caesar', 360). Possibly too early.

⁴⁰ For a convenient list of errors and anachronisms see O. Seel, *Sallust von den Briefen ad Caesarem zur Coniuratio Catilinae* (Leipzig and Berlin 1930) 49–52. That writer puts his emphasis on inadvertence.

[6] ⁴¹ Sall. Cat. 17.1.

⁴² Sall. Cat. 28.2.

⁴³ Sall. Cat. 26.2.

⁴⁴ Sall. Cat. 23.2.

Disquiet arises, and a suspicion about Sallust's treatment of Bestia. History knew the orations with which the tribune Bestia, in alliance with Metellus Nepos, assailed the consul after the execution of the Catilinarians. But Sallust can produce an intended harangue of the tribune as a signal for the conspirators to go to work. Sallust, it seems, is antedating and conflating. No evidence exists independent of Sallust to prove that Bestia was an associate of Catilina—or even to allege it.

If that is so, a valid consequence follows. Sallust, now setting up as a historian (and not in a spirit of undue humility), must labour under a grave imputation: deliberate malice against Bestia, or (on the better showing) culpable confusion.

Further (and subordinate), a paradox. If informed contemporaries were able to keep in their heads the transactions of December, 63, with the correct order of time, place, and motive (those events now appealed to curiosity and also to misrepresentation), they could discover and [8] relish one of the ironies of history: Bestia and Sallust, comparable as tribunes of the plebs, for both came into notoriety for harangues hostile to Cicero, suffering calamity thereafter, though neither in the intermediate sequel, and emerging each subsequently, but not to equal success or fame.

* * *

The pages of Sallust will not fail to be scrutinized (as is legitimate) for a hint of contemporary events, as disclosed by the author's selection and emphasis of person or incident. Curiosity is drawn to Sempronia, the wife of D. Junius Brutus (*cos.* 77). She benefits from a full-length presentation, such as is accorded only to Catilina, to Caesar, and to Cato.⁴⁵ Yet this lady can hardly be said to intervene in the action.⁴⁶

What is Sallust up to? Perhaps it was his design to depict the gay, elegant, and criminal society-lady as a type of the all-pervading corruption of the *nobilitas*. Not inconsistent with that, a further explanation has been produced: Sempronia was the mother of D. Brutus, one of the assassins of Caesar.⁴⁷

The notion (it must be conceded) is attractive, and it has been widely accepted. None the less, hesitation and doubts can be expressed. Decimus Brutus did not command attention for long after the War of Mutina. Furthermore, Sempronia might not be his mother, only his stepmother. It is a relevant fact that Decimus bears an additional *cognomen*, 'Albinus'. As his coins style him *Albinus Bruti f.*, he must be a Junius Brutus adopted by a Postumius Albinus.⁴⁸ A kinsman on the female side was often taken in adoption, to perpetuate a historic name. Thus did

⁴⁵ Sall. *Cat.* 25.

⁴⁶ She is named because of a meeting held in her house—*quod foro propinqua erat neque aliena consili propter Semproniam* (40.5: 'because it was near the forum and no stranger to the scheme on account of Sempronia', trans. A. J. Woodman).

⁴⁷ Promulgated (but not invented) by E. Schwartz, 'Die Berichte über die catilinische Verschwörung', *Hermes* 32 (1897), 570 = *Gesammelte Schriften*, 293–4.

⁴⁸ As elucidated by Münzer, *RE* V A, 369.

Sallust proceed, whose heir was the grandson of his sister. Therefore the mother of D. Brutus might have been a Postumia, an earlier wife of the consul of 77.⁴⁹

Who then was Sempronia? Perhaps a sister of the Sempronia who was the mother of Fulvia, Antonius' wife: Fulvia's family came in for comment and dispraisal in 43.⁵⁰ Styled *Sempronia Tuditani filia*, Fulvia's [9] mother was still extant in 52, exciting public attention after the murder of Clodius.⁵¹

* * *

For Bestia, as for Sempronia, relevance can be claimed to the events of 43. Sallust cannot be acquitted of unfairness towards Bestia: though Bestia (for all that anybody can tell) may have been one of those who supported Catilina for a time and artfully slid away before the point of danger, Sallust (it appears) goes beyond the evidence in his allegations.

Nor, when he came to write the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, will the historian have been hampered by any reluctance to present a highly unfavourable picture of the character and actions of Bestia's grandfather, the consul of 111.

This was not a lucky family, admired by contemporaries and enjoying good fame to posterity. The consul's son evades the record of history, unless he be discovered in the Bestia who went into exile in 90 when threatened with prosecution under the *Lex Varia*.⁵² There was a daughter, *Calpurnia Bestiae filia*, wife of the senator P. Antistius, who took her own life after the murder of her husband in 82.⁵³ her daughter Antistia was the first wife of the young Pompeius, repudiated when Sulla told him to marry his stepdaughter Aemilia.⁵⁴

Bestia the tribune was married several times. Caelius Rufus in his prosecution brought up startling allegations: Bestia had poisoned more wives than one, in an identical fashion, using aconite.⁵⁵ Perhaps one of these wives was a Sempronia: it will be recalled that Bestia's son (*suff.* 34) bears the nomenclature *L. Sempronius L. f. L. n. Atratinus*.⁵⁶

That item discloses a L. Sempronius L. f. unknown to historical record, who transmitted his name to the son of Bestia, having refurbished and annexed (by what claims or devices no man can say) the [10] *cognomen* of an ancient patrician house. There had been Sempronii Atratinii in the first century of the Republic, four consuls, and a military tribune, but their name vanishes from the *Fasti* after the *magister equitum* of 380.

The consul of 34, who retrieved the *dignitas* of his ancestors (but was not able to perpetuate his line) is a notable document of Roman political and social

⁴⁹ Cf. [added in pencil: 'the gay Sempronia'].

⁵⁰ Cic. *Phil.* 3.16.

⁵¹ Asc. 40.18–21.

⁵² App. *BC* 1.37. Lange suggested that he might have been a tribune of 91 (*Römische Alterthümer* III [Berlin 1876] 104). The notion has not found favour subsequently.

[7] ⁵³ Vell. 2.26.3.

⁵⁴ Plut. *Pomp.* 4.

⁵⁵ Plin. *Nat.* 27.54 (with the emendation of Ruhnken, M. *Caelius* for M. *Caecilius*).

⁵⁶ As the *Fasti Triumphales* show (*Inscr. It.* 13.1.86–7).

life. Like L. Gellius Poplicola (*cos.* 36), he is one of the prominent Antonians who echo back to the circle of Clodius.⁵⁷ Poplicola married his sister—her nomenclature is certified as ‘Sempronia L. f.’ by two Attic inscriptions.⁵⁸

Atratinus may have had another sister. A third inscription reveals a Sempronia Atratina, daughter of L. Sempronius Atratinus: she is identified as Poplicola’s wife, and the letters that follow her name are interpreted as part of a second cognomen—Paul<la>.⁵⁹ That might not be correct. The item should rather be taken as the beginning of her husband’s name.⁶⁰

Hence a Sempronia Atratina married to a nobleman with the *praenomen* ‘Paullus’. The choice is narrow.

First, Paullus Aemilius Lepidus (*suff.* 34), who had been proscribed by the Triumvirs. He first turns up in the company of Octavianus in 36.⁶¹ His intervening vicissitudes are not on record.⁶² Cornelia, of Scipionic descent, was his wife as early as 33, to judge by the fact that his elder son (L. Aemilius Paullus) becomes consul in AD 1: given the presumed age of Paullus, an earlier match is not excluded.

Secondly, Paullus Fabius Maximus (*cos.* 11 BC), born about 47. In that case Sempronia Atratina would be a daughter, not a sister, of the consul of 34. The only consort known of Fabius Maximus is Marcia, his wife in AD 14;⁶³ their son Paullus Fabius Persicus (*cos.* AD 34) was not born until c.AD 1.⁶⁴

[11] To conclude, after conjecture, with facts. Sempronius Atratinus is not catalogued by Cicero among the partisans of Marcus Antonius in the War of Mutina. He emerges in 40, when he spoke on behalf of Herod in the Senate;⁶⁵ and he became augur in that year, a valid indication.⁶⁶ An admiral of Antonius, he passed over to the better cause at a point that defies enquiry and lived on, to be proconsul of Africa and celebrate a triumph, in 21.⁶⁷ He confirmed by oratorical fame his début in 56, and he died in AD 7 at the age of eighty, bequeathing his estate to Caesar Augustus.⁶⁸

⁵⁷ Cf. Syme, *RR* 267. ⁵⁸ *IG* 2².4230 (Athens), 4231 (Eleusis).

⁵⁹ *IG* 2².5179 (Athens): ὁ δ[ῆμος] Σεμπρωνία Ἀτρατίνα [Λευκίου Σεμπρωνίου Ἀτρα]τείνου θυγάτηρ Παύ[λα Λ. Γελλίου Ποπλικόλα γυνή]. From the revision of P. Graindor, ‘Inscriptions attiques d’époque romaine’, *BCH* 51 (1927), 245–328, at 257.

⁶⁰ As was assumed on earlier readings of this inscription, which certified only this initial letter: there Dessau in *PIR*¹ S 280. Graindor (*o.c.*), having deciphered three more letters, saw the possibility of Παύ[λου] but [8] rejected it in favour of an additional *cognomen* for Sempronius Atratinus, whom it seemed advisable to identify with the known Sempronius L. f. of the other two inscriptions.

⁶¹ Syme, *RR* 237.

⁶² He has been identified with the Republican admiral Lepidus, attested after Lepidus (App. *BC* 5.2.9). But that might be a different person, the enigmatic P. Lepidus attested by coins, cf. M. Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas* (Cambridge 1946) 35–6.

⁶³ Tac. *Ann.* 1.5.2. ⁶⁴ Cf. *PIR*², F 51.

⁶⁵ Josephus *BJ* 1.284.

⁶⁶ *ILS* 9338. ⁶⁷ *Inscr. It.* 13.1.86–7.

⁶⁸ Jerome, *Chron.* p. 143 Schöne [= p. 165 H.], cf. *ILS* 9338. To Münzer’s article (*RE* IIA, 1366–8) an item may be added: his wife Annia. Observe the inscription *C. Annius Anniae/Atratinus A. Philogenus* (*CIL* 6.11748, whence the item *PIR*², A 703).

Rome and Arpinum

[1] The search for links between Roman politicians and local worthies can sometimes be remunerative. Aemilius Scaurus dedicates his memoirs to a Fufidius, who may well belong to an Arpinate family. Scaurus also knew the grandfather of Cicero, whose sound conservative politics earned his approbation. The first Tullius Cicero on record thwarted an attempt to introduce the open ballot for elections at Arpinum. The sponsor of this dangerous proposal was no other than his wife's brother, M. Gratidius.

The Gratidii are worth looking at. M. Gratidius crops up in another incident, this time at Rome, and he had the support of Scaurus. He prosecuted C. Flavius Fimbria (consul in 104 as colleague of Marius) for *repetundae*. The senior consular weighed in with his testimony, but Fimbria was none the less acquitted.¹

M. Gratidius went as *praefectus* with M. Antonius (*pr.* 102) on his campaign against the Pirates, and was killed in battle in Cilicia. Also present on the staff of the proconsul was his sister's son, L. Tullius Cicero.² The political allegiance of Antonius in these years, during his consulship (in 99), and later for a time is an entertaining problem. It is difficult to resist the argument that he was an ally of Marius.³

M. Gratidius married a sister of Marius. One of his sons therefore is that Gratidius whom Marius sent in 88 to take over the army of Sulla. He was killed by the troops. There was a son, it can be conjectured, the last of the line: M. Gratidius, legate with his kinsman Q. Tullius Cicero (*pr.* 62), proconsul of Asia from 61 to 58.⁴

To revert to the brother-in-law of Marius. His other son reinforced the link, being adopted by his maternal uncle M. Marius (*pr.* c. 102). He is styled M. Marius Gratidianus. It is enough to record briefly his success as a demagogue

¹ Cic. *Leg.* 3.36. Münzer, [*RE* VI, 2598–9, no. 88; VII, 1840, no. 2].

² Cic. *Brut.* 168; *De or.* 2.2.

³ E. Badian, 'Caepio and Norbanus. Notes on the Decade 100–90 BC', *Historia* 6 (1957), 318–36, at 331–3 [= *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (Oxford 1964) 34–70, at 46–7, 67].

⁴ Cic. *Flacc.* 49. Münzer [*RE* VII, 1840, no. 3].

when Cinna was dominant at Rome, the iterated praetorship, his tragic end—killed and mutilated by the victors. Catilina (it is alleged) carried his head from the Janiculum to the Temple of Apollo.

[2] A small detail is in danger of being overlooked. A fragment of Sallust, supplemented by a scholiast's notice on a Latin poet, reveals Catilina as the husband of Gratidianus' sister.⁵ That is to say, Gratidia is the first of the three wives of Catilina.⁶

* * *

Alliances shifted rapidly in these years. Political issues or personal rivalries imparted discord in groups and families at Rome and in the *municipia*. Schematic theories based on details of family relationships (generally deriving from fragmentary or casual record) are to be deprecated. What is known about the Gratidii and the Tullii of Arpinum can stand as a warning. None the less, the question is legitimate, how Cicero, with such close Marian connections, managed to avoid proscription or penalty.

The first notice about Tullii and Gratidii shows them linked by marriage but at odds on an issue of local politics. Cicero's grandfather married a Gratidia, the wife of his father was a Helvia.⁷ Helvia's sister married C. Visellius Aculeo [Cic. *Brut.* 264; *De or.* 2.2]. It may (or may not) be of consequence that this man is found at variance with M. Marius Gratidianus in a famous law suit [*De or.* 2.262]. The son is C. Visellius Varro—how and why he bears a *cognomen* different from that of his parent is a question. Why Varro? This Visellius Varro, Cicero's first cousin, notable on casual attestation as a friend of Caesar, had a paradoxical career—quaestor c.74, tribune of the plebs in 70 or 69, he emerges anomalously as curule aedile (an office of great promise) about 59, but dies soon afterwards.⁸ Some claim the Visellii as Arpinates beyond doubt. That is premature. The tribe of C. Visellius Varro is the *Quirina*, which indicates the Sabine country.⁹

Marii, Tullii, Gratidii (and perhaps two L. Fufidii), that seems to exhaust the count of senators from Arpinum. Cicero was ready to defend all manner of persons in the courts of law and eager to extend the sphere of his [3] personal influence. He spoke warmly for *tota Italia*, but it is not easy to detect any efforts to promote municipal friends to the senatorial order. There were numerous senators of that class. How many Arpinates, apart from those noted above?

⁵ Sall. *Hist.* 1.45 [= 37 McG. = 37 R.]; Schol. Bern. in Luc. 2.173.

⁶ She has no entry in *RE VII*. ⁷ Cic. *Leg.* 3.36; Plut. *Cic.* 1.1.

⁸ Cic. *Rep.* 2.175; *Off.* 3.69.

⁹ L. R. Taylor, *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic. The Thirty-five Urban and Rural Tribes* (Rome 1960) 274 [cf. also the note by J. Linderski in the second edition (Ann Arbor 2013) 377]; on C. Visellius Varro see H. Gundel, *RE IX A 1*, col. 355–8; on his tribal affiliation cf. *SIG*³ 747 [= *RDGE* 23] l. 62–3.

There were reputable Caesii at Arpinum. M. Caesius was the stepfather of Q. Fufidius, a L. Caesius was with Q. Cicero in Asia. But it would be hazardous in the extreme to adduce M. Caesius, who is on solitary and neutral record as praetor in 75. The *nomen* is indistinctive. Again, Q. Mamercius Q. f., a knight of Arpinum attested in 46 [*Fam.* 13.11.1]. A Mamercius, not a Mamercus, may have been either (or both) of the two mysterious persons serving under Lucullus and under M. Antonius (*pr.* 74). It is not easy to accept the senior consular Mam. Lepidus Livianus (*cos.* 77).

One might expect to be on firmer ground with T. Fadius, Cicero's quaestor in 63, a loyal and helpful tribune of the plebs in 57. He reached the praetorship not long after (it can be conjectured) for Cicero, writing to him in 52, says *adeptus ea quod non multi homines novi*.¹⁰ A doubt has been interposed, adducing a T. Fadius at Bononia, and a T. Fadius in an Umbrian town who has the tribe *Lemonia*, which is the tribe of Bononia.¹¹ Against which, however, will stand a L. Fadius, aedile at Arpinum in 44.¹²

Such, in all the Ciceronian testimony, abundant and manifold, is the case of Arpinum. Not much prospect therefore of finding senators from Sallust's town in this age. Only one can be dug up, C. Attius Celsus, praetor in 65.¹³ And not to any profit.

¹⁰ Cic. *Fam.* 5.18.1.

¹¹ L. R. Taylor, *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic. The Thirty-Five Urban and Rural Tribes* (Rome 1960) 272.

¹² Cic. *Att.* 15.5.1, 17.1, 20.4.

¹³ [[13] *ILS* 7385.]

The Consular Elections, 70–66 BC

[1] The elections of 66 had wide and distant repercussions. One of the aspirants, L. Sergius Catilina, returning from the governorship of Africa, was induced to desist, under pressure from the *principes civitatis*, whom the consul L. Volcacius Tullus had summoned to a secret conclave since grave charges were pending.¹ None the less, it was a sharp contest, won by P. Cornelius Sulla and P. Autronius. A prosecution for bribery dislodged them, Torquatus and Cotta winning their place at the second election.²

Hence, at the end of the year, certain malcontents on call, with rumours, threats, or allegations of revenge and a subversive movement that failed—and the thing grew more and more precise with the lapse of time. In other words, ‘the first conspiracy of Catilina’.

Cicero, when he defended P. Sulla some years later (in 62), artfully introduced Catilina into that plot. It was done to exculpate P. Sulla and segregate him entirely.³ The historian Sallust, who ought to have known better, saw no deception. He accepted this notion, and reinforced it. In a digression, inserted after the meeting of Catilina’s associates in the summer of 64, he harks back to a previous conspiracy in 66/5 and furnishes an elaborate version equipped with names and dates. Catilina is there, but not P. Sulla. Yet, it would seem, if there was a plot against the new consuls Torquatus and Cotta, it ought to be the plot of Sulla and Autronius.⁴

That is grave. The story was perpetuated by the authority of a classic historian. Furthermore, a century and a half after Sallust the uncritical erudition of the biographer Suetonius dug up allegations from a forgotten historian (probably Tanusius Geminus) and came out with a plot of Crassus and Caesar in support of the failed consuls Sulla and Autronius—but, this time, a conspiracy which omitted the name of Catilina.⁵

Interchangeable names and alternate roles, that is not the only [2] suspicious feature. The genesis of the myth needs to be traced. That done, and inspection of the inherent improbabilities, the whole fabrication collapses.

[All the notes in this paper have been added by the Editor.]

¹ Asc. 89.8–12.

² MRR II, 157.

³ Cic. *Sull.* 51–2.

⁴ Sall. *Cat.* 18.5.

⁵ Suet. *DJ* 9.

A question arises. How and why did the ‘first conspiracy of Catilina’ win and maintain credence over long years among scholarly enquirers in the modern age? That is an entertaining theme, and sadly instructive.

Various explanations offer. First, the failure to diagnose the origin of the legend and analyse the proliferations. Second, that anachronistic preoccupation with the biography of Julius Caesar which does so much harm to the understanding of history. Third, a total neglect of the acts or threats of violence at Rome in the previous year. For that, it is enough to look at standard accounts.

Not only the year 67. It is expedient to go back to 70. The *coup d'état* achieved by the two generals Pompeius and Crassus dealt Sulla's oligarchy a deadly blow. The tribunes at once got back their powers.⁶ Hence a dire prospect. Sallust is explicit. Young men of eager ambition stirred up the plebs and attacked the Senate, with power and renown hereby accruing—*ipsi clari potentesque fieri*. On the other side stood most of the *nobiles*, *senatus specie, pro sua magnitudine*. In short, both damnable. The *honesta nomina* were paraded on each side, but ten individual politicians strove for power, ruthlessly, *pro sua quisque potentia certabant*.⁷

None the less, the complete revolution in 70, and no surrender. The Optimates retained many resources which can be defined in the traditional fashion as *vetus nobilitas, maiorum fortia facta, cognatorum et adfinium opes, multae clientelae*.⁸ Despite tribunes and the *comitia tributa* they might hope to engross something like a monopoly of consulships. Whatever the political issues and contentions, the consulship had a place apart, not always closely relevant or thereby influenced. As of [3] old, the known names tended to dominate the *comitia centuriata*.

The rule of privilege is perpetuated—family and coteries, close alliances or opportunistic compacts, with marvellous scope for the managers of patronage. When birth, wealth, and personality count (not a principle or a policy), a sharp question arises. Where are the candidates to be found, are they good enough on traditional or even mediocre standards of public excellence? In default of striking ability, numbers can count, as the Metelli showed. Statistics as well as personal merit came into play.

The oligarchy after Sulla quickly ran into trouble of all kinds. For one thing, not enough aristocrats on supply.

The casualties inflicted by the *Bellum Italicum* and the whole ten years of tribulation do not fail to exhibit their effects. When Sulla became Dictator, hardly any ex-consuls were available. Some of the consuls in the next decade disappear almost at once: only eleven were alive in 71. Not a formidable body to face the demands of Pompeius and Crassus.

⁶ G. Rotondi, *Leges publicae populi Romani* (Milan 1912) 369.

⁷ Sall. *Cat.* 38.3 [‘they became distinguished and powerful’... ‘ostensibly on behalf of the Senate, but in fact for their own greatness’... ‘each of them was competing for his own power’].

⁸ Sall. *Jug.* 85.5 [‘the old nobility, the brave deeds of the ancestors, the wealth of relatives and in-laws, the many bonds of *clientela*’].

The Dictator had been at pains to bring back houses of the *nobilitas* that had been in eclipse. The results did not become apparent for some time. There is a plain dearth of aristocratic candidates in the seventies and for a number of years thereafter. It is with a younger generation, young enough to have survived the wars, that Sulla's investment began to pay.

What were the prospects of the oligarchs in 70 and after? The Metelli are at the core of the *factio*. Metellus Pius had no son, but three Metelli on attestation in 70 looked promising. Q. Metellus (later to be styled 'Creticus') was standing for the praetorship in 75, as is revealed by a fragment of Sallust describing a riot in that year.⁹ His year of office is not established. Perhaps in fact 74—it would be hard to keep out a Metellus. Or perhaps 73. He may have been a consular candidate in 71, squeezed out by the intrusion of the two generals. As for the two [4] brothers of Creticus, Lucius was praetor in 71, Marcus in 69.¹⁰ There were also two sons of a cousin of Creticus, about ten years younger, however—Q. Celer (*cos.* 60) and Q. Nepos (*cos.* 57).¹¹

Ap. Claudius Pulcher (*cos.* 79), was married to a Metella, but his sons would have to wait for some time, viz. Appius (*cos.* 54), Gaius (*pr.* 55), Publius (*aed. cur.* 56).¹² The Corneli Lentuli, as usual, were numerous and importunate. However, after Clodianus (*cos.* 72) and Sura (*cos.* 71) there is a gap in ages. Half a dozen emerge later, a whole cluster of mediocrity—Lentulus Niger (*pr.* 62), Spinther (*pr.* 60, *cos.* 57), Marcellinus (*pr.* 60, *cos.* 56), Clodianus (*pr.* 59), Crus (*pr.* 58, *cos.* 49). To their generation belongs P. Lentulus Marcellinus, not heard of subsequent to his quaestorship in 74.¹³ Finally, for various reasons it might be well not to lose sight of the enigmatic Lentulus Vatia—or perhaps two persons of that name.¹⁴

As for consular families now reascent through act and favour of Sulla, two Valerii Messallae will be noted, the cousins Niger (*cos.* 61) and Rufus (*pr.* 61, *cos.* 53).¹⁵ Also to the patriciate belong various Manlii Torquati and Sulpicii—but those houses succeed in producing only one consul apiece, L. Torquatus (*cos.* 65) and Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (*pr.* 65, *cos.* 51).¹⁶ The Julii Caesares had been rising already with the consul of 90, who had a son, L. Caesar (*cos.* 64).¹⁷ Another and distant branch of the Julii surmounted their alliance with Marius, and also exploited it in the person of C. Caesar (*pr.* 65, *cos.* 59).¹⁸

Nor, to mention several families of the plebeian nobility, does there seem to have been available in 70 (and down to 66) a Domitius, a Junius, a Licinius, a Marcius, or a Claudius Marcellus.

⁹ Sall. *Hist.* 2.42 M. [= 42 McG. = 38 R.] ¹⁰ MRR II, 122 and 131–2.

¹¹ RE III, 1, 1208–10, no. 86 and 1216–18, no. 96.

¹² RE III, 2, 2849–53, no. 297; 2856–57, no. 303; IV, 1, 82–8, no. 48.

¹³ RE IV, 1, 1390, no. 231.

¹⁴ RE IV, 1, 1377, no. 209 and 1402, no. 241.

¹⁵ RE s. 2, VIII A 1, 162–5, no. 266; 166–9, no. 268.

¹⁶ MRR II, 157 and 158, 240.

¹⁷ RE X, 1, 465–8, no. 142 and 468–71, no. 143.

¹⁸ RE X, 1, 187–8, no. 131.

On this showing (which is fragmentary and not exhaustive) certain noble houses could present no candidates in 70–66. The field was poor, and stayed so for some time, to judge by those offering in 65 and 64. Cicero in a letter to Atticus discusses his own prospects.¹⁹ First, the consuls of 64. L. Caesar was pretty sure to succeed, he opined—[5] it would suit Cicero's book if Thermus (i.e., a Minucius Thermus) came in with him. Thermus was in competition with D. Junius Silanus. But, Cicero suggests, since both Thermus and Silanus lacked fame and friends, it might be possible to shove in somebody else. This item is of some interest. The manuscript reading is *Curius*. No plausible Curius is to hand. The name should be altered to *Turius*. Cicero in the *Brutus* refers to an obscure *novus homo*, L. Turius. Not very bright, but a hard worker—*parvo ingenio sed multo labore*.²⁰ So this man nearly achieved the consulship. Some scholars put Turius' remarkable performance in the late seventies.²¹ It should belong rather to the context of 64.

Cicero (it is worth noting) registers no patrician competing with L. Caesar, who in fact was elected. His colleague is L. Marcius Figulus.²² Cicero had not mentioned this aristocratic candidate. Had he been completely out of touch with the political managers? Or is this consul to be held the same person as Thermus? That is, a Minucius adopted by a Marcius. It is a problem.

For his own year, Cicero in the same letter catalogues eight possible contestants. One was already in the field, eagerly—*prensat unus P. Galba*.²³ Too eagerly, Cicero says, to do him much good. Next, as certain candidates along with P. Galba (who was a patrician, also a *pontifex*), Cicero names C. Antonius (the brother of M. Antonius, *pr.* 74) and Q. Cornificius. The latter, tribune in 69, belongs to a family of local repute at Lanuvium, which *municipium* had not so far been able to produce a consul. Thus (Cicero proceeds) some even fancied Caesonius. This man (M. Caesonius, praetorian aedile in 69, praetor presumably in 66) is the first senator of the name in Roman annals, and the last until the age of the Severi.²⁴ Next, C. Aquillius Gallus (*pr.* 66), the illustrious lawyer, whose health and whose addiction to his profession made it unlikely that he would in fact stand.²⁵ Catilina, however, could be counted on, if he got acquitted at the trial for *repetundae*.²⁶ (Soon after he wrote this letter the orator had serious thoughts of undertaking the defence).²⁷

Finally, Aufidius, and Palicanus. Cicero knows that Atticus will not expect him to waste space on such persons. The former is the obscure [6] T. Aufidius, praetor (it is presumed) in 67, proconsul in Asia in 66/5.²⁸ He began as a *publicanus* in that province; and he was an old man already, being a coeval of C. Julius Caesar Strabo (*aed. cur.* 90). The Aufidii are a fairly recent name in

¹⁹ Cic. Att. 1.1.

²⁰ Cic. Brut. 237.

²¹ Cf. RE s. 2, VII A 2, 1388–9, no. 2.

²² MRR II, 161.

²³ Cic. Att. 1.1.1.

²⁴ RE III, 1, 1317–18, nos. 1 and 3.

²⁵ RE III, 1, 327–30, no. 23.

²⁶ Cic. Att. 1.1.1.

²⁷ Cic. Att. 1.2.1.

²⁸ RE II, 2, 2289–90, no. 12.

the Roman Senate—not that this person need be assumed their kinsman.²⁹ And the consulship of Cn. Aufidius Orestes in 71 imports a deceptive lustre.³⁰ Not an Aufidius by birth, but an Aurelius Orestes of consular stock, adopted by the senator Cn. Aufidius.³¹

The latter, Palicanus, is M. Lollius Palicanus, tribune of the plebs in 71 when he conducted negotiations with the generals outside the gates of the City. Palicanus gets a brief mention from Cicero in the *Brutus*.³² After mentioning the demagogue L. Quinctius (*tr. pl.* 74) he adds *aptior etiam Palicanus auribus imperitorum*. Sallust is more explicit and condemnatory—*humili loco Picens, loquax magis quam facundus*.³³ His home country was Picenum, in the *clientela* of the Pompeii. Confident no doubt of help from the tribune A. Gabinius he was emboldened to push his candidature in 67 (it happens to be known also that Gabinius' wife was a Lollia).³⁴ The consul C. Piso blocked him.

So far Cicero's prognostications. When the electoral season arrived in the summer of 64, four of these eight persons had faded out entirely (Caesonius, Aquilius, Aufidius, and Palicanus). Despite which, Cicero had no fewer than six competitors, for two fresh candidates had turned up. Asconius in commentary on *In toga candida* furnishes the names, with summary labels.³⁵ First, the excellent C. Licinius Sacerdos (*pr.* 75), *qua virtute qua constantia vir*, as Cicero was to style him many years later. Not wholly without reason, for he had been the predecessor of Verres as governor of Sicily.³⁶ Of Sacerdos the commentator drily observes *nulla improbitate notus*.³⁷

Second, L. Cassius Longinus (*pr.* 66), who at this time appeared *stolidus magis quam improbus*.³⁸ Cassius belongs to a famous and rigorous house of the new plebeian nobility (their first consul in 171). His precise relationship to the other Cassii of the period (such as the consul of 73) would be worth knowing. Licinius Sacerdos, however, cannot be assigned to the noble Licinii: all but the first senator in his family, according to [7] the scholarly Asconius.³⁹

If cheap stuff like Turius, Aufidius, and Palicanus earns a mention, if a worthy person of municipal extraction but no conspicuous talent such as Q. Cornificius can aspire to the highest honour, the aristocracy must indeed be short on numbers and on quality. Cicero himself had good luck as well as skill and merit. Some of the reasons for the shortage have been indicated—and, in fact, after a few years the *nobiles* pick up. By paradox the last years of the Republic display on the Fasti an effulgence of the *magna nomina*. Not only three Claudii Marcelli. In all but one of the years 54–49 one of the consuls

²⁹ *RE* II, 2, 2288–9, no. 5.

³⁰ *RE* II, 2, 2295–6, no. 32.

³¹ *RE* II, 2, 2289, nos. 6–7.

³² *Cic. Brut.* 223.

³³ *Sall. Hist.* 4.43 M. [= 38 McG.] = 33 R.

³⁴ *Val. Max.* 3.8.3. Lollia: *Suet. DJ* 50.1.

³⁵ *Asc.* 82.7–15.

³⁶ *Cic. Planc.* 27.

³⁷ *Asc.* 82.13.

³⁸ *Asc.* 82.14.

³⁹ *Asc.* 82.9.

is a patrician, and the ostensible exception, Metellus Scipio in 52, is by birth patrician.⁴⁰

* * *

Some of the indications have now been furnished about the electoral prospects of aristocratic families in the quinquennium 70–66 inclusive. The evidence is defective. There is also a deficiency of another order. No ancient source mentions any competitors at the elections in the years 70, 69, and 68. And it is only by chance that a candidate in 67 emerges to knowledge, M. Lollius Palicanus.⁴¹

A further impediment. The whole period from Sulla down to 66 is badly documented. Very little is known about the previous careers of most of the consuls before Cicero's year. Aediles are important, especially curule aediles; their games and shows establish popularity and a pledge for the consulship. It is properly regarded by an orator as a matter of note if men choose to pass over that office, or, defeated, none the less became consuls in the end. The enquirer is baffled on this rubric. Only eleven aediles can be allocated with precision to the period 81–68.⁴² That is to say, one fifth.

Again to take the praetorship from 81 to 66. If the count is limited to indubitable descendants of praetorian families, the result is instructive. Apart from those praetors who either reached the consulship or dropped out (death or condemnation in the courts), the names of only [8] twelve can be recovered, six of them praetors in 70–66.

Of those twelve aristocratic praetors, two are on record as unsuccessful candidates in 64, viz. L. Cassius Longinus and P. Sulpicius Galba.⁴³ Among the others some might appear desirable or at least potential candidates, such as L. Piso Frugi, praetor in 74; he was certainly alive in 70.⁴⁴

Other factors will be taken into account. First, deaths from disease or an epidemic—such as can plausibly be conjectured in 69 or 68. Second, political mishaps. For example, nothing more is heard of P. Cornelius Dolabella, praetor in 69, governor of Asia in 68/7.⁴⁵ He may have succumbed to prosecution on his return. Only a casual notice reveals, for example, that M. Aurelius Cotta (*cos.* 74) was condemned in 67.⁴⁶

* * *

With such prolegomena for caution, one can now turn to the year 70 and its aftermath. The elections came on before the next blow to the government, namely the prosecution of Verres and the loss of the law courts. They produced normal and all but predictable consuls: Q. Metellus and Q. Hortensius (*pr.* 72), the brother-in-law of Catulus, the oligarchic leader.⁴⁷

⁴⁰ *MRR* II, 234–5.

⁴¹ *Val. Max.* 3.8.3.

⁴² *MRR* II, 83, 97, 102, 122, 127, 132.

⁴³ *RE* III, 2, 1738–9, no. 64.

⁴⁴ *RE* III, 1, 1895–6, no. 98.

⁴⁵ *RE* IV, 1, 1300, no. 140.

⁴⁶ *Val. Max.* 5.4.4; *Memnon* 39.3–4, *FGrHist* 3B 367; *Cass. Dio* 36.40.3–4.

⁴⁷ *MRR* II, 131.

Three anecdotes related by Cicero are instructive. First, Scribonius Curio in public congratulated not Hortensius but Verres—for the election foretold acquittal.⁴⁸ Second, Verres himself, neatly turning a phrase now proverbial annexed the credit for the success of Metellus—*te non fato, ut ceteros ex vestra familia, sed opera sua consulem factum*.⁴⁹ Third, Metellus brought argument to bear on the deputies from the Sicilian cities: he had been elected consul, one of his brothers was at the moment governor of the island (i.e. Lucius, *pr.* 71), the other would preside at the *repetundae* court the next year (i.e., Marcus, *pr.* 69).⁵⁰

The Metelli were deeply compromised by and through the indefensible Verres. Pompeius in the harangue he delivered outside the gates [9] of Rome denounced the pillagers of provinces in harsh words, linking to that theme the notorious corruption of senatorial jurymen.⁵¹ Verres was duly condemned, the courts taken from senatorial control. And in the next year another criminal governor had to face a prosecution, M. Fonteius. Luckier than Verres, he had Cicero for advocate. The outcome is not on record.

Various grievances removed, what resources or allies could Pompeius rely upon in the sequel? The young *imperator* lacked influential connections or strong spokesmen among the consulars—unless Lentulus Clodianus and Gellius Poplicola, consuls in 72 and censors in 70, be reckoned in that class. For what it is worth it can be noted that his wife Mucia (the third wife) had no consular kinsfolk alive.⁵² On the other side, no small disfavour had accrued. Men recalled the ugly deeds of the *adulescentulus carnifex*;⁵³ some resented the overshadowing of Metellus Pius; others believed, or professed to believe, that Crassus deserved the fame of crushing the servile rebellion in Italy.

The long years of command in Spain enabled Pompeius to collect a number of adherents, few, however, senior enough to be potential candidates for a long time. Nor was it easy to trust in a *novus homo*, even if he had earned conspicuous merit by warfare. On L. Afranius nothing stands on record between his capture of Calaguris (in 72, or rather perhaps in 71) and the year 66, when he served as legate of Pompeius in the war against Mithridates.⁵⁴ Somewhere in between fell his praetorship and the province which brought him a triumph. There happens to be no proconsul of the Cisalpina on record between 72 and 67. As for the Spains between 71 and 65, only M. Pupius Piso, who held a triumph in 69, and C. Antistius Vetus, proconsul 68/7.⁵⁵

Tribunes who had kept up a tenacious opposition to the optimates in the years before 70 expected a recompense. L. Quinctius, C. Licinius Macer, and

⁴⁸ Cic. *Verr.* 1.7. ⁴⁹ Cic. *Verr.* 1.10. ⁵⁰ RE III, 1, 1206, no. 78.

⁵¹ Cic. *Verr.* 1.15. ⁵² RE XVI, 1, 449–50, no. 28.

⁵³ Val. Max. 6.2.8 ['teenage butcher']. ⁵⁴ RE I, 710–12, no. 6.

⁵⁵ MRR II, 133 and 133, 139 (dating his tenure to 69/68).

M. Lollius Palicanus got their praetorships.⁵⁶ With which, their success and their value seemed to lapse. Quinctius was elderly, fifty when he became tribune, and not an amiable person. Those responsible for his [10] farther promotion had cause to repent—*quanto in odio postea fuit illis ipsis per quos in altiore locum ascenderat!*⁵⁷

Crassus was in better posture. A valuable notice in Plutarch registers his influence with the Senate after 70, in contrast to Pompeius.⁵⁸ He had the resources, also perhaps the taste, for an ambiguous policy, at variance with the optimates, but the same time a rival to Pompeius. Crassus was eager to repair the break with the oligarchs. Not long after 70 he secured Metella, the daughter of the consul of 69, as bride for his elder son, a fact which, ignored by historians and biographers, stands revealed on the mausoleum on the Via Appia—*Caeciliae Q. Cretici f.—Metellae Crassi*.⁵⁹ The son of this match is M. Licinius Crassus (*cos. suff.* 30). In pursuance to this skilful device the second son, Publius, married Cornelia, daughter of the Scipio Nasica who entered the family of the Metelli by the testament of Pius.⁶⁰ It may be added that the alliance between Crassus and Metellus Creticus had certain repercussions, if not a split in the Metelli. Celer and Nepos served under Magnus in the eastern war.

* * *

Meanwhile, however, the Metelli were able to keep their predominance at the polls, L. Metellus and Q. Marcius Rex being elected in 69. The latter, not on record previously, is a clear member of the *factio*. He had married one of the three daughters of Ap. Claudius Pulcher (*cos.* 79); the husbands of the other two were L. Lucullus and Metellus Celer.

Then accident intervened. The consul L. Metellus died at the beginning of 68. Also a consul suffect before he could enter an office. His name would be worth knowing. A late source, the Chronographer of the Year 354, which is elsewhere useful in registering, paradoxically, the names of persons elected but not holding the *fascies*, furnishes the name *Vatia*.⁶¹ Who might he be? P. Servilius Vatia (*cos.* 79) was the son of a Metella. This man might be his nephew, a son of C. Servilius (*pr.* 102). There is a further possibility, a Cn. Lentulus Vatia. The slave revolt in 73 started from an incident at Capua, in the gladiatorial establishment [11] owned by a Cn. Lentulus. One source calls him *Lentulus Batiatus*.⁶² The *cognomen* is surely corrupt. Emendation will give *Vatia*, that is a Servilius adopted by a Cn. Cornelius Lentulus.

No other consul was elected (a remarkable fact) and Q. Rex held office alone. The years 69 and 68 exhibit a certain lull, except for the agitation to supersede

⁵⁶ *MRR* II, 132 (69 BC, Lollius Palicanus) and 138 (68 BC).

⁵⁷ Cic. *Clu.* 110 ['and how much he was later hated by those very people through whom he had attained a more prominent position!'].

⁵⁸ Plut. *Pomp.* 22.3.

⁵⁹ *ILS* 881.

⁶⁰ *RE* IV, 1, 1596–997, no. 417.

⁶¹ *Chronica minora*, I, ed. Mommsen, p. 55, AUC 686.

⁶² Plut. *Crass.* 8.1.

Lucullus. L. Quinctius (praetor in 69 or 68) took up again the quarrel which began in Lucullus' consulship. In consequence, Lucullus lost the province of Asia. And before long Cilicia was taken from him and assigned to Q. Rex.⁶³

The next consuls were C. Calpurnius Piso and M. Acilius Glabrio, both coming by rapid passage—they had been praetors in 70—but Piso had to spend a huge sum, so Sallust records, to buy off a prosecutor.⁶⁴

They were soon in for trouble from tribunes. Gabinus' first action was to finish the demolition of Lucullus' command.⁶⁵ His bill provided that Bithynia-Pontus should be Glabrio's consular province. More important, the proposal to create a special command against the Pirates. The enacting of the *lex Gabinia* was attended by much violence. Piso's life was in danger more than once; Gabinus tried to have a hostile tribune deposed by vote of the people; and, on a later occasion, he even threatened to have Piso unseated.

Catulus and Hortensius stand out as the leaders of the optimates, with Piso to help, pertinacious in opposition to Pompeius. Piso, apart from his strong party allegiances, is something of a mystery. Neither his parentage nor his relationship to the other Pisones of the time can be established. Some have supposed, without warrant, that he is a brother of L. Piso Frugi (*pr.* 74) and of M. Pupius Piso (*pr.* 72).⁶⁶ Conjecture is baffled.

By contrast, his colleague. No activity is registered, save for a quarrel with the praetor L. Luccius, whose curule chair he ordered to be smashed.⁶⁷ Otherwise and in general, a dull fellow. Cicero in the *Brutus* refers to the *socors ipsius ingenium neglegensque*.⁶⁸ When he went out to his [12] province, he made no haste to approach the seat of war. It took no strong arguments to displace him by the bill of the tribune Manilius in 66.

Glabrio, it is true, when praetor happened to be president of the extortion court. Cicero makes loud appeal to his integrity and public spirit. Which does not suffice to prove him an enemy of the Optimates. Nor, on the other hand, can it be certain that he still nourished a grudge against Pompeius for something that had happened over twenty years before—in a season of divorces imposed for various reasons Glabrio at Sulla's command had to surrender to Pompeius his wife Aemilia, the daughter of old Scaurus.⁶⁹ Nothing indicates a strong party man, he evades notice almost completely after his consulship and is named for the last time in 56, incidentally, because he was one of the *pontifices*.⁷⁰

The tribunes in 67 exercised a kind of tyranny, so it seemed to some of the historians. Another writer speaks of the *furialis fax tribunicia*.⁷¹ They did not

⁶³ Cass. Dio 36.15.1.

⁶⁴ Sall. *Hist.* 4.81 M. [= 78 McG. = 71 R.].

⁶⁵ G. Rotondi, *Leges publicae populi Romani* (Milan 1912) 371–2.

⁶⁶ *RE* XXIII, 2, 1987–8, no. 10.

⁶⁷ Cass. Dio 36.41.2.

⁶⁸ Cic. *Brut.* 293.

⁶⁹ Plut. *Pomp.* 9.2–3.

⁷⁰ Cic. *Har. Resp.* 12.

⁷¹ Val. Max. 3.8.3 ['the Fury's torch of the tribunate', trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey].

enjoy licence and impunity for long. The *factio* was alert to regain control and exact vengeance. According to Sallust, when Pompeius went away to the wars, *plebis opes imminutae, paucorum potentia crevit. ii magistratus provincias aliaque omnia tenere; ipsi innoxii florentes sine metu aetatem agere ceterosque indicibus terrere*.⁷²

The first test of strength was the consular elections. Violence was rife, and the consuls obtained a bodyguard by vote of the Senate.⁷³ Palicanus was a candidate. The consul Piso, on enquiry from the tribunes, told them that if Palicanus got elected he would declare the poll invalid. Palicanus being then blocked, suitable consuls were produced, M.' Aemilius Lepidus and L. Volcacius Tullus. Disturbances also impeded the praetorian elections, so that Cicero enjoyed the distinction of coming in at the head of the polls three times in succession.

M.' Lepidus can be presumed a descendant of M.' Lepidus (*cos.* 158).⁷⁴ Grandfather and father have left no trace in history, and his only known previous office is that of proquaestor in Asia c.78.⁷⁵ As consul Manius did nothing. However, a casual notice discloses him the year after in the group of the five influential consulars who testified against C. Cornelius (*tr. pl.* 67), the *principes civitatis qui plurimum in senatu poterant*.⁷⁶ The next [13] fifteen years reveal nothing consonant with this disclosure. But Lepidus survived. He is discovered in the early months of 49, an anxious neutral, in the company of his erstwhile colleague, the inconspicuous Volcacius.

Volcacius is the first consul of that name. The family derives from Perugia. That is made clear by a poem which Propertius addresses to his homonymous nephew, consul in 33.⁷⁷

The success of Volcacius may have been a surprise. Previously he had been defeated for an aedileship, a bad sign.⁷⁸ Otherwise no record, except that is difficult not to identify him with the L. Vo[l]ca[c]ius, one of a board of ten tribunes, revealed by an inscription.⁷⁹ The year can only be either 72 or 68 (71, 70, and 69 are excluded). Strong reasons speak for 68. If this Volcacius then is the consul of 66, only one expectation could avail. Volcacius may have sought to advance his prospects by standing for the tribunate, despite his praetorian rank.

His connexion, supporters, and his allegiance, that is indeed a problem. Barely mentioned in all the later years down to 49, Volcacius is discovered with a group of Pompeius' adherents who in February of 56 urged that Pompeius should have the commission to restore the king of Egypt.⁸⁰ No evidence

⁷² Sall. *Cat.* 39.1: 'the resources of the plebs were diminished, the power of the few increased. They held magistracies, provinces, and everything else. They were themselves secure, flourishing, and lived without fear, terrifying others with criminal prosecutions'.

⁷³ Cass. Dio 36.39.1.

⁷⁴ *RE* I, 550–1, no. 62.

⁷⁵ *MRR* III, 6.

⁷⁶ *Asc.* 60.20.

⁷⁷ *Prop.* 1.22.3.

⁷⁸ *Cic. Planc.* 51.

⁷⁹ *ILS* 5800. See R. Syme, 'Ten Tribunes', *JRS* 53 (1963), 55–60, at 57 [= *RP* 2, 557–65, at 561].

⁸⁰ *Cic. Fam.* 1.1.3, 1.2.1–2, 1.4.1.

for a man's attitude a decade earlier. Yet this man may have had the support of the tribunes Gabinius and Cornelius when he stood in 67—Pompeius (as has been indicated) was short of suitable candidates.

By paradox, the sole named action of either consul is that of Volcarius, and it depends on solitary testimony, that of Asconius.⁸¹ He tells how Volcarius and the consulars thwarted Catilina's candidature.

Who are these influential *principes civitatis*? Surely the chieftains of the oligarchy were there. Not that they need have been unanimous. Lutatius Catulus, for example, was a friend of Catilina,⁸² and one will wonder about Crassus. When the trial for *repetundae* came on at last in the next year, many consulars spoke in Catilina's favour. Not Metellus Pius, however. He testified against. The Africans were in his inherited *clientela*.

The debarring of Catilina suggests a question. For whose benefit was it done? Whether Volcarius in fact took the initiative or acknowledged [14] the *auctoritas* of certain consulars, his action had one clear result. The elections were approaching. Only one patrician could get elected. If Catilina were eliminated, either L. Manlius Torquatus or P. Cornelius Sulla benefits.

It remains to ask, whom did the government want for consul? So far as can be known, Torquatus and Cotta. Torquatus, like M.' Lepidus, belonged to a patrician family now emergent from long eclipse (no Manlius consul for a century). He had recently been proconsul of Asia (in 67/6), and, if the anomalous titlature of a Greek inscription can be trusted, legate for a brief space with Pompeius against the Pirates.⁸³

C. Aurelius Cotta (*cos.* 75) a crafty intriguer, was described by a speaker in Sallust's *Historiae* as *ex factione media consul*.⁸⁴ There is no reason to fancy that the third brother, Lucius, was deficient in guile, or distasteful to the Optimates.⁸⁵ He sponsored the new *Lex iudiciaria* of 70,⁸⁶ it is true, but his measure can be interpreted as an artful device to save all that could be saved for the Senate.

* * *

The hopes set on Torquatus and Cotta were dashed. The polls brought a resonant victory to the other patrician: *omnibus centuriis P. Sulla renuntiatus est*.⁸⁷ On the second round, a *novus homo*, P. Autronius Paetus came in.⁸⁸

What factor contributed to the defeat of the optimate faction? In the first place one looks for traces of Pompeius and Crassus—not, however, without bearing in mind complications and cross-currents.

⁸¹ Asc. 89.9–12.

⁸² Sall. *Cat.* 35.

⁸³ T. Wiegand, 'Vorläufiger Berichte über die von den königlichen Museen in Milet und Didyma unternommenen Ausgrabungen. Bericht 6', *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1 (Berlin 1908) 20 [= *Inscriptionen von Milet*, VI, 3 (Berlin 2006) n. 1121].

⁸⁴ Sall. *Hist.* 3.48.8 M. [= 34.8 McG. = 15.8 R.: 'from the inner ring of the oligarchy'].

⁸⁵ *RE* II, 2, 2485–7, no. 102.

⁸⁶ G. Rotondi, *Leges publicae populi Romani* (Milan 1912) 369.

⁸⁷ Cic. *Sull.* 91: 'P. Sulla was proclaimed by all the *centuriae*'.

⁸⁸ *RE* II, 2, 2612, no. 7.

P. Sulla was a nephew of the Dictator and a man of great wealth. Further, a neglected fact. As later emerges, he had a stepson called Memmius, i.e., C. Memmius, *tr. pl.* 54,⁸⁹ probably the son of C. Memmius, Pompeius' [15] quaestor in Spain⁹⁰—and husband of Pompeius' sister. It can therefore be argued that P. Sulla married Pompeia in the late seventies.

As for Autronius, no certain piece of evidence. But it is likely enough that he had the support of Crassus.

The Optimates hit back. Cotta and Torquatus put in a charge of *ambitus*.⁹¹ Though violent attempts were made to break up the court, not once but twice, the pair were found guilty. So the *centuriae* were convoked a second time, Cotta and Torquatus being elected.⁹² There is no word of any other candidates.

In the course of the year the Optimates showed their power and their rancour in other ways. They encouraged indictments of objectionable tribunes. Thus C. Cornelius. He, however, was rescued for the moment, thanks to the vigour of loyal friends who frightened off the prosecutors (small men, the two Cominii).⁹³ Gabinius was safe, having gone away to be a legate of Pompeius—the Optimates disputed the legality of his position on some quibble or other.⁹⁴ But Manilius, as soon as his office lapsed in December, was in danger of a charge before the *quaestio repetundarum*. The case was held over until the next year—when Manilius, like Cornelius, was indicted for *maiestas*.⁹⁵

That was not all. Vengeance now overtook C. Licinius Macer, a vigorous champion of popular rights, who had been tribune in 73. Returning from the governorship of a province he had to face charges of extortion and was condemned, although Crassus had undertaken his defence.⁹⁶ Among the victims of this may be enrolled L. Vargunteius, perhaps an adherent of Crassus.⁹⁷

So far, therefore the turbulence of 67 and 66, the failures and the exacerbation. Had they been able to concert their efforts and enmities, a notable collecting of malcontents might have mustered to celebrate the last days of the dying year or devise trouble for the new consuls. First, in proper prominence, Sulla and Autronius. Then the friends and allies of ex-tribunes in jeopardy. And, last of all, L. Sergius Catilina, thwarted and indicted for *repetundae*, now biding his time, but not the man to forswear ambition or relax his duty to refurbish the *dignitas* of an ancient line.⁹⁸

* * *

[16] The clouds gathered, a storm threatened. What happened? The answer is: nothing, or next to nothing.

False or flimsy allegations arose quickly, legend proliferated. By paradox, the only testimony that can with safety be invoked and testified is that of a late

⁸⁹ *RE* XV, 1, 616–18, no. 9.

⁹⁰ *RE* XV, 1, 608–9, no. 7.

⁹¹ *Cic. Sull.* 92; *Sall. Cat.* 18.2; *Asc.* 75.7–9.

⁹² *MRR* II, 157.

⁹³ *Asc.* 59.16–17.

⁹⁴ *Cic. Man.* 57–8.

⁹⁵ *Cic. Corn.* F 10, 12; *Asc.* 60.9–18; *Plut. Cic.* 9.6.

⁹⁶ *Cic. Att.* 1.4.2; *Val. Max.* 9.12.7; *Plut. Cic.* 9.1–2.

⁹⁷ *Cic. Sull.* 6.

⁹⁸ See e.g. *Cic. Att.* 1.1.1, 1.2.1; *Cat.* 1.18; *Sull.* 81.

and derivative writer, the historian Cassius Dio.⁹⁹ To this effect, Autronius and Sulla made a plot to assassinate the consuls who supplanted them. They could not achieve it—the news got abroad and the Senate voted the consuls a bodyguard. Further, a motion for investigation was before the Senate, but a tribune interposed his veto.

So far, Dio is useful. He furnishes a fact (that is rare in the context of this transaction), namely a tribune's veto. But Dio's account is tainted by the stigmata of the subsequent elaborations. He adds two other names, Cn. Piso and Catilina—they joined in the enterprise of Autronius and Sulla.

A plot of the two disappointed candidates is patently the nucleus of the story—and its origin. They had a precise and legitimate grievance against Cotta and Torquatus. Why the accretions, Piso and Catilina?

First, Catilina. Cicero, to discredit his competitor in 64, produced sundry allegations in the speech *In toga candida*. One of them, which deliberately eschews detail, is a plot of Catilina and Piso. The item recurs in 63, Catilina either with or without Piso. Then, after the suppression of Catilina's conspiracy, it was all too easy. And a fresh incentive supervened.

Defending P. Sulla in 62, Cicero had to play down and dismiss allegations about 66/5. Which he contrived in various ways. One is to insert Catilina in the place of the virtuous and innocuous Sulla. A challenge to that deceit and equivocation in which the advocate excelled. There was an obstacle. Torquatus avowed nescience of the murder plot. And, in 65, Torquatus uttered laudatory testimony on behalf of Catilina at the trial for *repetundae*.¹⁰⁰ Cicero somehow manages to surmount or evade that obstacle.

Next, Cn. Piso, who had gone out to govern Hispania Citerior.¹⁰¹ He was dead when Cicero delivered *In toga candida*.¹⁰² Anything could be said about [17] this Piso.

Cn. Piso is a valuable clue. Sallust takes over Cicero's version, with additional detail and corroboration. His whole setting of the 'First Conspiracy of Catilina' repays inspection. A plain truth emerges—the digression, in which Piso has a large part, follows on remarks about the ambitions of Crassus and is designed by the author as annotation on Crassus perhaps more than on Catilina.¹⁰³

That is important. An opinion long dominant and still persistent will have it that Sallust in the first monograph was eager all through (and notably in this transaction) to cover the memory of Caesar and clear him of any complicity with Catilina. On the contrary, its preoccupation is with Crassus, which, even if malicious, shows political judgement. Crassus was incomparably the more important figure.

⁹⁹ Cass. Dio 36.44.3–5.

¹⁰⁰ Cic. *Sull.* 81.

¹⁰¹ Sall. *Cat.* 19.1.

¹⁰² Asc. 92.20–5.

¹⁰³ Sall. *Cat.* 19.

Sallust, however, was uncritical in that he took over from Cicero the story of a murder plot designed for January 1 (with Catilina, but not Sulla); and he produced the elaboration of a further and failed attempt on February 5.¹⁰⁴ The latest stage of the story is patently absurd. It is served up by Suetonius with citation of sundry authorities.¹⁰⁵ Crassus and Caesar are the moving spirits, with Sulla and Autronius and Piso—but no Catilina. Once again, fraud, credulity, and interchangeable names.

This version with variants or addenda has been accorded credence by a multitude of scholars. One reconstruction, edified with art and with eloquence, takes the eye—and invites demolition. That done, the debris ought to be swept away, and nothing more said.

[18] To conclude. It is expedient to go back to the aftermath of the year 70 and examine the various perturbations in 67 and 66, the intrigues, the threats, and the rioting. In this setting allegations about failed plots to murder consuls fall into their proper place and proportion.

¹⁰⁴ Sall. *Cat.* 18.

¹⁰⁵ Suet. *DJ* 9.

Catilina's Three Marriages

[1] Wherever evidence is abundant about the Roman aristocracy, it tends to disclose iteration in matrimony. There is no mystery about the causes—political matches and political divorces, also the deaths of women in childbirth. Sulla and Pompeius reached a total of five wives, Caesar only three.

For Catilina, two are on clear record, the one anonymous, the next Aurelia Orestilla. But there was an earlier wife, sister of M. Marius Gratidianus, called Gratidia.¹ Cicero discreetly refrains from mentioning this lady, who was the first cousin of his father. Sallust when composing the first monograph may not yet have become aware of her existence. He repaired the omission later on. A fragment from Book I of the *Historiae* can be put in the context of Catilina and the atrocious murder of Marius Gratidianus—*et liberis eius avunculus erat*.² A scholiast on Lucan states that Gratidianus was the brother of Catilina's wife.³

This item, marriage to a niece of C. Marius, throws brief illumination on an obscure phase in the life of the patrician noble, before he comes on show as a partisan of Sulla, a friend of notable oligarchs. His earliest mention happens also to be fortuitous, in the *consilium* of Cn. Pompeius Strabo in 89.⁴

Even if he had not butchered her brother, Catilina would be eager to discard Gratidia and seek an advantageous match promptly. At least four significant divorces can be discovered, whether or no explicitly enjoined by Sulla.

All posterity knows the anecdote extolling the courage of the young Caesar who repelled the menaces or blandishments of the Dictator and refused to give up Cornelia, the daughter of Cinna. Duly noting that story, Velleius Paterculus chronicles the compliance of another man, M. Pupius Piso (*q.* 83), who separated from a recently acquired wife, Annia, Cinna's widow.⁵ Velleius (or his source) knew and suppressed a more notorious divorce, that of Pompeius. He discarded his Antistia to get an Aemilia, [2] daughter of Aemilius

¹ For Gratidii, cf. [Sallust 55 and 'Rome and Arpinum', no. 11].

² Sall. *Hist.* 1.45 M. [= 37 McG. = 37 R.: 'he was the maternal uncle of his children'].

³ Schol. Bern. in Luc. 2.173. Cf. Maurenbrecher and Münzer, *RE* XIV, 2, 1825–7, no. 42.

⁴ *CIL* 1².709; cf. C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (Leipzig and Berlin 1922) 147.

⁵ Vell. 2.41.2.

Scaurus and stepdaughter of the Dictator. To facilitate which alliance, Sulla and the Metelli brought pressure on the husband of Aemilia, namely M.' Acilius Glabrio (*cos.* 67), who divorced her, although she was pregnant.⁶

The name of Pompeius' first wife was better forgotten. It recalled an unsavoury episode in the life of the young adventurer who ended as an ostensible champion of the Republic. Pompeius had to face prosecution in 86 when an attempt was made to recover the booty annexed by his father at the capture of Asculum. He had powerful advocates. Further, collusion was suspected when, after his acquittal, he married the daughter of P. Antistius, the president of the tribunal.⁷ Velleius, who is silent about this transaction, records what happened to Antistius. He was massacred in 82 along with other senators suspected of treachery to the Marian cause. His wife committed suicide: *Calpurnia, Bestiae f.*, member of an unlucky family.⁸

A fourth instance emerges from the story about Sulla's last marriage: a young lady of birth and beauty who had recently been divorced, Valeria, artfully ensnared his attention at the games.⁹ This Valeria can be identified as a sister of M. Messalla (*pr.* 61, *cos.* 53), often styled Rufus to distinguish him from his cousin *Niger*, the consul of 61.¹⁰ Further, she is a niece of Hortensius. The Valerii Messallae were now emerging from long eclipse (no consul since 161). It would be worth knowing who had been Valeria's husband—and whether he or she insisted on the separation.

Catilina (it can hardly be doubted) severed his link with the cause and family of Marius. His next wife is known only from a nasty and anonymous imputation in the *First Catilinarian*. After removing her—*nuper cum morte superioris uxoris novis nuptiis locum vacuefecisses*—Catilina added a second crime.¹¹ That second crime is made explicit by Sallust, who omits the first.¹² Catilina, consumed with love for Aurelia Orestilla, killed his son because the lady objected to having in the house a *privignus adulta aetate*. The historian is guilty of the incautious statement *pro certo creditur*.

[3] Orestilla may conveniently be identified as a daughter of Cn. Aufidius Orestes, who is not heard of after his consulship in 71. Cicero in the speech *In toga candida* brings up incest as well as adultery in the court against Catilina—*ex eodem stupro tibi et uxorem et filiam invenisti*.¹³ Asconius, noting that L. Lucceius made the same charge, confesses his perplexity—*nomina harum mulierum nondum inveni*. Asconius, ever alert for prosopographical detail, does not like to be baffled, compare his remarks on the mother-in-law of

⁶ Plut. *Sull.* 33.3.

⁷ Plut. *Pomp.* 5.

⁸ Cf. Vell. 2.26.3–4.

⁹ Plut. *Sull.* 35.

¹⁰ Cf. R. Syme, review of A. E. Gordon, *Potitus Valerius Messalla Consul Suffect 29 BC*, *JRS* 45 (1955), 155–60, at 156–7.

¹¹ Cic. *Cat.* 1.14 ['when you recently made room for a new wife by bringing about the death of the previous one'].

¹² Sall. *Cat.* 15.2–3.

¹³ Asc. 91.24–26.

L. Piso.¹⁴ In this instance the acute commentator is not short of facts. For once, he missed the point. Cicero is imputing adultery with the wife of Aufidius Orestes, incest therefore in Catilina's marriage to Aurelia Orestilla.

Orestilla herself had already been married, for she had a daughter.¹⁵ This girl turns up later. Caelius in the spring of 50 sends Cicero some pieces of metropolitan gossip. Paulla Valeria has divorced her husband on the day of his return from a province, she is going to marry D. Brutus, and young Cornificius is betrothed to the daughter of Orestilla.¹⁶

Next, that third marriage. It might be put about 67 or 66, allowing for the *privignus adulta aetate* ['adult stepson']. Furthermore, something can be done to impair the allegations of antecedent crime, and also to enhance the desirability of Aurelia Orestilla as a bride.

It is always well to be on the look-out for a sequence of unhealthy seasons or a pestilence at Rome, under Republic or Empire.¹⁷ There may in fact have been an epidemic in 69 or 68. L. Metellus, consul in 68, died at the beginning of the year, and he was quickly followed by the *suffectus* who perished before entering office.¹⁸ It would be an entertaining task, and perhaps remunerative, to draw a list of persons of some status or prospects who fade out after the late seventies and are never heard of again. For the present, one can point to a pair of casual items about deaths—not that they prove anything. First, Caesar, quaestor in 69, lost both his aunt and his wife and gained a chance for self-advertisement with funeral orations.¹⁹ The widow of Marius might seem a historical relic, due to pass away. What of Cornelia? Death in child[4]birth (and death of the child) is the easy surmise, to be sure—and not to be rebuked by the notion (strange indeed and portentous) that Caesar was sterile after the birth of his only certified progeny, his daughter Julia.²⁰ Second, Cicero's first cousin Lucius died in December of 68.

Catilina's second wife may have died about this time—from natural causes, then, a little later, his son. Also Cn. Aufidius Orestes, who was fairly old anyhow, having been praetor in 77. Also the husband of Aurelia Orestilla: that marriage must have been very recent, and Orestilla herself young, if the allegation could be made that she was Catilina's daughter.²¹ However, perhaps it was divorce that propelled her into the arms of L. Sergius Catilina.

¹⁴ Asc. 10.19–22: *socrus Pisonis quae fuerit invenire non potui, videlicet quod auctores rerum non perinde in domibus ac familiis feminarum, nisi illustrium, ac virorum nomina tradiderunt* ['I was not able to find out who was Piso's mother-in-law, obviously because historians have not recorded in households and families the names of women, unless they were distinguished, as those of men'].

¹⁵ Sall. *Cat.* 35.3.

¹⁶ Cic. *Fam.* 8.7.2.

¹⁷ Cf. Tac. *Hist.* 2.92–3.

¹⁸ Cass. Dio 36.3.4.

¹⁹ Suet. *DJ* 6.

²⁰ J. P. V. D. Balsdon, 'The Ides of March', *Historia* 7 (1958), 80–94, at 86–7.

²¹ Asc. 91.24–92.1.

According to Sallust, beauty was her only recommendation—*quoius praeter formam nihil umquam bonus laudavit*.²² That is not quite just. Orestilla had a proud lineage. The Aufidii are nothing much, but her father was an Aufidius only in name, having been adopted by the old blind senator Cn. Aufidius, who wrote history in Greek.²³ He was by birth an Aurelius Orestes, it can be affirmed, hence probably a son of the consul of 103 (himself the third consul in the line). The wealth of her father is attested, and she kept control of her property after marriage. Aurelia Orestilla was therefore a great heiress, providentially made available to Catilina through several deaths, eminently desirable and worth an effort, as was that Lepida, daughter of Mam. Lepidus Livianus (cos. 77), who set Cato and P. Scipio at variance.²⁴

²² Sall. *Cat.* 15.2 ['No good man praised anything about her except her appearance'].

²³ Cic. *Tusc.* 5.112, *Fin.* 5.54. Adoption: Cic. *Dom.* 35; cf. RA 385–6.

²⁴ Plut. *Cat. Min.* 7.1–2. Cf. [Cic. *Att.* 2.1.9].

Crassus, Catilina, and the Vestal Virgins

[1] Sallust was careful to place Crassus in suspicious vicinity in 66 and 64.¹ It would further be useful could links be discovered between Crassus and associates of Catilina. As for Cn. Piso, Sallust is positive that Crassus was the author of his despatch to Spain.² That is to say, in the first instance, Piso was an agent of Crassus—perhaps it is only his death that turns him into a Catilinarian.³ However, Autronius (it can be argued) was Crassus' candidate in 66.⁴ And, touching L. Vargunteius, it may be relevant that the next Vargunteius on record (and the last) perished with Crassus in Mesopotamia.⁵

There appears to be an early and neglected link between Crassus and Catilina—the prosecution of the Vestal Virgins in 73. That transaction can only be recovered from sporadic pieces of evidence, and it tends to be passed over in modern narratives of the period.⁶

The evidence is as follows. First, two items of a general character. The Allobroges disclosed to the Senate the gist of a conversation with Lentulus Sura. He told them about the oracle of the three Cornelii destined to rule at Rome (the predecessors being Cinna and Sulla). He added that the present year was portentous of doom, in that it was the tenth after the acquittal of the Vestals, the twentieth from the burning of the Capitol.⁷

The other passage concerns the oratorical proficiency of M. Pupius Piso (*pr.?* 72). [2] After early promise as a speaker he had rather faded out. But now he came to fame—*ex virginum iudicio magnam laudem est adeptus*.⁸ It can be added that Piso, quaestor in 83 and coeval with Crassus (born in 115 or 114), and with Hortensius (born in 114),⁹ in fact came rather late to his praetorship: the date, 72 (or probably 71) is deduced from his triumph in 69 from one of the Spanish provinces.¹⁰

¹ [See *Sallust*, 91–100].

² *Sall. Cat.* 19.1.

³ *RE* III, 1, 1379–80, no. 69.

⁴ Cf. *Cic. Brut.* 241; *Asc.* 75.7–9, 88.16–18.

⁵ *Plut. Crass.* 28; *Oros.* 6.13.3.

⁶ H. Last, 'The Breakdown of the Sullan System and the Rise of Pompey', *CAH* IX (Cambridge 1932) 313–49, at 326–34; J. Carcopino, *Histoire romaine*, II (Paris 1935) 615–16.

⁷ [*Cic. Cat.*] 3.9.

⁸ *Cic. Brut.* 236.

⁹ *Cic. Brut.* 230.

¹⁰ *Inscr. It.* 13.1.565. See *RE* XXIII, 2, no. 10, col. 1988.

Next, in relation to Catilina Sallust is vague, with no sign that there was a prosecution—*iam primum adulescens Catilina multa nefanda stupra fecerat, cum virgine nobili, cum sacerdote Vestae, alia huiusce modi contra ius fasque*.¹¹ However, this item got into the historical tradition. There is a precious notice in Orosius—Fabia was the Vestal, and Catilina got off through the protection of Lutatius Catulus.¹² Asconius, overstating a deliberately obscure passage in Cicero's speech *In toga candida*, discloses the fact that this Fabia (prosecuted and acquitted) is in fact Fabia, the sister of Cicero's Terentia.¹³ The only other testimony to her existence comes from Plutarch.¹⁴

Finally, Crassus. According to Plutarch, he was incriminated for relations with the Vestal Licinia, but was able to proffer an apologia.¹⁵ His interest with the lady was pure and financial: she owned a valuable piece of suburban property.¹⁶ Plutarch states that Crassus was acquitted by the jury. It is perhaps a question how far the indictment had gone...

[3] Prosecutions of Vestals tended to have a political origin or background. Men would have in mind the last occasion.¹⁷ In 114 charges were raised against three of the priestesses: Aemilia, Licinia, Marcia. The *pontifex maximus* Metellus Delmaticus held an inquiry, after which he pronounced against Aemilia, but cleared the other two. Suspensions arose and were exploited. In the next year the tribune Sex. Peducaeus came forward with a bill enforcing a strict enquiry. A *quaestio* was instituted, the redoubtable L. Cassius Longinus Ravilla (*cos.* 127) presiding. As a result, Licinia and Marcia were condemned—and several others, according to Asconius, for Cassius comported himself *nimiam asperitate*.¹⁸

The political aspect of this affair has not escaped notice—it was an attack on the Metelli, the dominant *factio* in the government, and families in their alliance.¹⁹

When in 73 an action was started that involved Crassus and Catilina, nobody can have missed the point. It was an attack on Sulla's party in the persons of two members who were vulnerable, being profiteers from the Proscriptions, each notorious in his fashion. One can compare, on a lower level of social and political interest, an item from the year 64. Prosecutions were instituted before the *quaestio de sicariis* (Caesar presiding) against L. Luscius, the Sullan centurion who had acquired a fortune of ten million sesterces, and L. Bellienus, the uncle of Catilina.²⁰

¹¹ Sall. *Cat.* 15.1 ['From the very first Catilina as a young man had carried out many unspeakable acts of illicit sex, with a noble virgin, with a priestess of Vesta, and other similar deeds contrary to divine and human law'].

¹² Oros. 6.3.1.

¹³ Asc. 91.20–2.

¹⁴ Plut. *Cat. Min.* 19.

¹⁵ Plut. *Crass.* 1; *Inimic. util.* 6.

¹⁶ Not in *RE* s.v. Cf. *RE* XIII, 1, col. 498, no. 185.

¹⁷ Cf. Asc. 45.27–46.4. See *MRR* 1.537.

¹⁸ Asc. 46.5–6.

¹⁹ Münzer, *RA* 243–4.

²⁰ [Asc. 91.1–2.]

[4] The prosecutors would be worth knowing. One name is attested—a man named Plotius indicted Licinia. Conjecture is valid about his identity. Plotius, tribune of the plebs in 70, the year that overtured the demolition of Sulla's order, produced the bill *de reditu Lepidanorum*. Also, his *Lex Plotia agraria*, for the veterans of Pompeius and Metellus.²¹ There is no discomfort, but every advantage, in holding him the same man as the Plotius who was legate under Pompeius three years later in the campaign against the Pirates.²²

For the sacred virgins of Vesta, deprived of home and family and bound to ritual and routine, compensation offered in food and drink and high society. Chance and a late author reveal a dinner party of the *pontifices* in or shortly before 69, when Lentulus was inaugurated as *flamen Martialis*.²³ The menu was lavish, beginning with hors d'oeuvres that included *ostreas crudas quantum vellent* ['raw oysters, as many as everybody liked']. More important, the partakers of this bounty. The names of four Vestals are recorded: Arruntia, Licinia, Perpennia, Popillia. Two more can be added on this evidence, viz. Fabia and Fonteia.²⁴

The Vestals enjoyed another traditional compensation—intrigue and influence. Licinia, one might have fancied, was kin to M. Crassus. The fact emerges casually that she was a relative of L. Licinius Murena (of a new family from Lanuvium) whose candidature she furthered in 63.²⁵ As for Fonteia, Cicero makes play with her name when defending her brother in 69.²⁶ M. Fonteius (*pr.*? 75) was a minor Verres who [5] in a three-year governorship had been guilty of grievous exactions. He pillaged the province of Gallia Transalpina. Sallust, it appears, was alert. A fragment of Sallust's *Historiae* carries a reference—*his praeter solita vitiosis magistratibus*.²⁷

Only Fabia and Licinia are alleged delinquent. It would be idle to canvass Fonteia or the remaining three, but the names present a certain interest for social history. Perpennia belongs to an Etruscan family newly ennobled with M. Perpenna (*cos.* 130) and his son (*cos.* 92, *ensor* 86).²⁸ As for Arruntia, the first attested senator of that name is L. Arruntius, who after a variegated career ends as consul in 22—and goes on to write a history of the *Bellum Punicum* in the manner of Sallust.²⁹ Popillia is perhaps more remunerative. She belongs to a house of the plebeian *nobilitas* now in decay (their last consul was P. Popillius Laenas, *cos.* 132). The wife of Cn. Piso (Crassus' adherent) was probably Popillia M. f. (a daughter of the consul 139, colleague of a Cn. Piso).

²¹ Cf. *MRR* II, 128. Cf. E. Gabba, '«Lex Plotia agraria»', *PP* 5 (1950), 66–8 [= *Esercito e società nella tarda Repubblica romana* (Florence 1973) 443–7].

²² *Contra MRR* II, 149, 151 n. 17, 241 (A. Plotius/Plautius, *pr.* 51). Cf. Gabba, ['«Lex Plotia agraria»', 66, 68 = *Esercito e società*, 444, 446, on the identification of the proponent of the bill with the tribune of 70 BC].

²³ Macrob. *Sat.* 3.13.11.

²⁴ Cf. *MRR* II, 135–6.

²⁵ Cic. *Mur.* 73.

²⁶ [Cic. *Font.* 47.]

²⁷ Sall. *Hist.* 3.46. Cf. [Sallust, 211 n. 143].

²⁸ [MRR 1.501–2; II, 17.]

²⁹ *PIR* I, 220–1, no. 1129. [Cf. Sen. *Ep.* 114.17–21.]

Another Popillia M. f. baffles identification. Alluding to the inferiority of the animal world to human beings, in the matter of sexual indulgence, she produced the aphorism: the epitome *bestiae enim sunt*.³⁰

[6] So far the priestesses of Vesta. Plotius prosecuted. Who defended? In the first instance the eminent Catulus, leader of the oligarchy after the decease of Marcius Philippus. He saved Catilina, who in the letter reproduced by Sallust (an authentic letter) is duly grateful—*egregia tua fides, re cognita, grata mihi magnis in meis periculis, fiduciam commendationi meae tribuit*.³¹ Next, M. Pupius Piso, whose eloquence benefited from the exercise, not less his career, for he became praetor soon after (either in 72 or 71) and proceeded to an important province. There may have been another advocate for the defence, not so respectable, the loud-voiced and cynical Autronius. Cicero shows him active in *stupratorum defensionibus*.³² If so, he should have earned some gratitude from Crassus and Catilina.

* * *

What were the consequences for Crassus? No doubt annoyance and exacerbation—and still less affection for the dominant group, although it was their enemies who had attacked him. None the less, Crassus got his command against the slaves the year after, the consuls having failed calamitously. It is unfortunate that the year of his praetorship stands nowhere in direct attestation. It is generally assumed to be 73. It might have been 75 or 74 (given his age). One would like to know something about his relations with M. Antonius, praetor in 74—or, better, with the master of patronage, P. Cethegus, the artful renegade, whose operations can be detected in various transactions of that year. [7] It was Cethegus who engineered the special command of Antonius on the Mediterranean coasts.³³ Further, Lucullus, desiring Cilicia for his province, had to apply to the good offices of Cethegus—not by direct approach but through the agency of a woman called Praecia.³⁴ Cethegus, so Cicero, affirms, knew the *res publica* inside out,³⁵ achieving hereby the *auctoritas* of a consular. Crassus may have learned from Cethegus those arts of management and jobbery in which he was able to display so consummate a mastery after that consulship in which he was overshadowed by Pompeius.

³⁰ Macr. [Sat. 2.5.10].

³¹ Sall. Cat. 35.1 ['Your exceptional fidelity, known to me by experience and welcome to me in my great dangers, gives confidence to this commission of mine', trans. A. J. Woodman.].

³² Cic. Sull. 71 ['in the defence of dishonourable acts']; cf. [Brut. 241]. ³³ [MRR II, 111.]

³⁴ Plut. Luc. [6.2–4]; cf. Cic. Par. 40. [See F. Miltner, 'Praecia', RE XXII (Stuttgart 1953) 1192.]

³⁵ Brutus [178].

Sallust on Crassus

[1] After he has chronicled the meeting of Catilina's associates in the summer of 64, the historian goes on to mention secret supporters and then passes to a belief held at that time: Crassus knew what was afoot, any resources would be welcome against Pompeius, his hated rival, and if the venture succeeded, he might put himself at the head of the movement.¹

After which, the digression is led on—*sed antea item coniuravere pauci*...² In the account of the plot to assassinate the consuls, designed for January 1 of 65, but postponed to February 5, and then dropped, Cn. Piso has lavish and conspicuous mention. Further, he is the subject of the second part of the digression—*postea Piso*...³ That job, the author says, was the work of Crassus, for he knew that Piso was a bitter enemy of Pompeius. Further, the Senate was not unwilling, for mixed reasons—and to be sure *iam tum potentia Pompei formidulosa erat*.⁴ Subsequently, after Piso has been killed in Spain by native cavalrymen, the author registers the report that these natives had been [2] from of old trusty clients of Pompeius: he was behind the deed.

Examined in this fashion, the digression takes on a special significance. The aims and ambitions of Crassus—especially in relation to Pompeius—precede it—and it terminates on the same theme. That is to say, it is an annotation on Crassus. Indeed, it may be an afterthought—Sallust, mentioning rumours about Crassus, was led from Crassus to Cn. Piso to the abortive attempts of January 1, or February 5.

[3] After this, Crassus fades out. Sallust does not bother to mention Crassus or anybody else in relation to the consular elections. Cicero in fact had six competitors, so Asconius reports.⁵ Four of them had no chance at all, *prope iacebant*. Two were *nobiles*, P. Sulpicius Galba and L. Cassius Longinus, two new men, all but the first senators in their families, viz. C. Licinius Sacerdos (*pr.* 75) and Q. Cornificius (of a reputable family of Lanuvium).⁶ Catilina and Antonius

¹ Sall. *Cat.* 17.7.

² Sall. *Cat.* 18.1 ['A small number likewise conspired against the commonwealth', trans. A. J. Woodman].

³ Sall. *Cat.* 19.1.

⁴ Sall. *Cat.* 19.2 ['at that time Pompeius' power was already a source of fear'].

⁵ Asc. 82.3–8.

⁶ R. Syme, 'Missing Senators', *Historia* 4 (1955), 52–71, at 53, 60–1 [= *RP* 271–91, at 272, 280].

stood in a close compact to knock down Cicero—and, adds Asconius, they had strong support from Crassus or from Caesar. A passage from *In toga candida* alleges that Catilina and Antonius came by night to the house of a certain *nobilis* who was well known *in hoc largitionis quaestu*. Either Caesar or Crassus, that is the comment of Asconius.⁷

Nor did it at all suit the purpose of Sallust to spread himself on the election of 63. In the design of this economical writer nothing matters but Catilina's defeat, which is quickly and prosaically registered.⁸ Indeed, D. Junius Silanus only comes in when essential, at the debate on 5 December, and the historian can dispense entirely with his colleague, L. Licinius Murena.⁹ There had been a fourth candidate, Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (*pr.* 65), if not others.

Where Crassus stood in this context, there is no sign. Well before the *contio domestica* in which Catilina proclaimed himself *dux et signifer calamitosorum* or the scene in the Senate the next day when Catilina used threatening language about the *duo corpora rei publicae*, he may already have abated his interest in Catilina.¹⁰ The alienation of [4] Crassus helps explain the desperation of Catilina.

As the months passed, rumours grew strong and circumstantial about an armed rising. Letters came to Crassus, and he showed them to Cicero on the night of October 20. In his company were two senators, Metellus Scipio (*q. c.* 65) and M. Marcellus (*q.* 64). This is the account which Cicero gave himself in *De consulatu suo*.¹¹

The Senate met on the next day. Q. Arrius then reported the mustering of armed men in Etruria.¹² This isolated notice is not without interest. Arrius (*pr.* 73) was a follower of Crassus, and would often second him as an advocate.¹³ There was some prospect of Arrius being a candidate at the elections of 59.¹⁴ In consequence of these revelations, the Senate passed the *senatus consultum ultimum*; and Manlius in fact raised the shadow of revolt at Faesulae on October 27. Crassus, it is clear, was eager to dissociate himself from his old friend. And, now, to revert to Sallust. Crassus is named among the five senators who were made responsible for the custody of the conspirators: he took charge of Gabinius Capito.¹⁵ The detail is not of any great significance. The next mention of Crassus is portentous and revealing, in more ways than one.

[5] At the session of December 4, the informer Tarquitius named Crassus. He said that Crassus told him to take messages to Catilina urging him not give up hope merely because Lentulus, Cethegus, and the others had been arrested, but on the contrary to hasten his march on Rome. The scene ensuing when

⁷ Asc. 83.15–18.

⁸ Sall. *Cat.* 26.5.

⁹ Sall. *Cat.* 50.4.

¹⁰ Cic. *Mur.* 50–1 ['commander and standard-bearer of the wretched'].

¹¹ Plut. *Cic.* 15; *Crass.* 13. For Marcellus, cf. the mention in *Cat.* 1.21.

¹² Plut. *Cic.* 15.

¹³ Cic. *Brut.* 52.

¹⁴ Cic. *Att.* 1.7.11; cf. 2.7.3. Note two different individuals in *RE* II, 1, 1252–4, nos. 7–8. Cf. *CPL* 133; *MRR* Suppl. 7.

¹⁵ Sall. *Cat.* 47.4.

this fellow names a *hominem nobilem, maxumis divitiis, summa potentia* could be imagined, if it were not reported by the historian.¹⁶ Some held the information incredible, others authentic (but inadvisable to exploit in this season), and a large number were bound to Crassus by ties of private interest. Hence loud protests, and the Senate decreed that Tarquitius had borne false witness.

Sallust subjoins comment. Some people at the time thought that Tarquitius acted at the suggestion of Autronius, a protective device *quo facilius, appellato Crasso, per societatem periculi reliquos illius potentia tegetet*.¹⁷ But others saw the hand of Cicero, alert to prevent Crassus from essaying his customary tactics of causing trouble, *suscepto malorum patrocínio*. Such indeed was Crassus' own version of the affair. Sallust had heard it from his lips—*ipsum Crassum ego postea praedicantem audivi*.¹⁸

The notice excites curiosity on various counts. First, the occasion. The Senate in 55 witnessed a violent altercation between Crassus and Cicero.¹⁹ After an angry outburst [6] Crassus retorted in kind and used the odious word *exul*.²⁰ Crassus may have brought up the matter—and Sallust may have been there to hear it (his quaestorship probably belongs to the year 55).²¹

There is another explanation. The historian gives no sign that Crassus actually alluded to the matter in a senatorial debate. Better, in private conversation, and perhaps more than once. That suits the language.²²

So far so good. There is a further step that some have taken. Was Sallust not an adherent of Crassus? To confirm which, the *Invectiva in Ciceronem* is confidently adduced. That document purports to be the reply of a senator who has been attacked by Cicero. It begins *graviter et iniquo animo maledicta paterer, M. Tulli* ('I should be troubled and angered by your abuse, Marcus Tullius'). The dramatic date appears to be 54, after Cicero defended Vatinius, but before his defence of Gabinius. Now some hold fast to the Sallustian authorship of this pamphlet (Quintilian believed it genuine).²³ But there is a glaring improbability—mutual damnation of Cicero and this junior senator in 54. Where is the way out? It is supposed that Sallust wrote the thing as a pamphlet, impersonating an enemy of Cicero, i.e. Crassus. This young man was moved to righteous indignation by the dishonesty of Cicero notably as exemplified in the reconciliation with Caesar which occurred in November of 50.²⁴ And he wrote as a declared partisan of Crassus.²⁵

¹⁶ Sall. *Cat.* 48.5 ['a nobleman, a very wealthy man, of unsurpassable power'].

¹⁷ Sall. *Cat.* 48.7 ['so that, when Crassus was named, by association his power would protect the others from danger'].

¹⁸ Sall. *Cat.* 48.9 ['I later heard Crassus himself making that claim'].

¹⁹ Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.20.

²⁰ Cass. Dio 39.60.1.

²¹ Gelzer, *RE* VI A, 952.

²² K. Büchner, *Sallust* (Heidelberg 1960) 35.

²³ [Quint. 4.1.68].

²⁴ Cf. *Fam.* 1.9.20.

²⁵ Büchner, *Sallust*, 36.

[7] Further confirmation is sought in a passage of the *Invective* which alleges that Cicero is laying claim to political affinity with Crassus: *Verum, ut opinor, homo novus Arpinas, ex L. Crassi familia, illius virtutem imitatur, contemnit similitudinem hominum nobilium, rem publicam caram habet*.²⁶ Most peculiar, and not to be credited. The remedy was seen long ago.²⁷ It is Marius, not Crassus that Cicero imitates, in his *virtus*, his [*text missing*: ‘*patria*?’]—and his feuds with the *nobiles*. The reading *C. Mari* is therefore adopted by the latest editor.²⁸

That is not all. Few can be found in these days to accept the *Invective* as either contemporaneous or Sallustian.²⁹ It is patently a product of the schools of rhetoric, an impersonation or *prosopopoeia* of the kind so useful in the elite education, as Quintilian attests.³⁰

No evidence therefore for the political affiliations of the young senator. His treatment of Crassus in the monograph is distinctly hostile, culminating in the description of Crassus’ pernicious practices, his *patrocinium malorum*. No impediment, perhaps, to the notion that Sallust for a season long ago had been a partisan of the dynast. For that matter, he may have been an adherent of Pompeius in 53 or 52. When tribune in 52 he is discovered acting in close concord with the friends and allies of Clodius, and Clodius had been giving active support to Pompeius’ candidates for the consulship, Metellus Scipio and Plautius Hypsaeus.³¹

[8] When Sallust a few years later came to compose the *Historiae*, his resentment against Sulla’s men, the pretensions of the *nobiles*, and the *potentia* of the great politicians acquired a sharper edge. The narrative offered various opportunities to show up Crassus. For example, the prosecution of the Vestal Virgins in 73. Above all, however, his consulship.³² Pompeius had expected Crassus to be grateful and deferential. That was too simple. Their vanity and rivalry soon turned to open dissidence. At the exit of the year a public ceremony of reconciliation was staged—on the suggestion (it is said) of a Roman knight from the country who had been visited by a dream. Plutarch’s account shows Crassus taking the initiative with noble words of appreciation.³³ Whatever be the truth about that transaction there is extant a fragment of the *Historiae* censoring Crassus for lack of political judgement during his consulship—*Crassus obtrectans potius conlegae quam boni aut mali publici gravis exactor*.³⁴

²⁶ *In Cic.* 4 [‘But, I suppose, a new man from Arpinum, from the family of L. Crassus, imitates that great man’s merits, scorns the enmity of the nobles, holds the commonwealth dear’].

²⁷ Cf. G. Jachmann, ‘Die Invektive gegen Cicero’, in *Miscellanea Academica Berolinensis* 2 (1950), 235–75, at 274–5.

²⁸ K. Vretska, *C. Sallustius Crispus. Invektive und Episteln*, I (Heidelberg 1961).

²⁹ Only Büchner, *Sallust*, 20–40 and Vretska, *Invektive*, 12–15. Cf. R. G. M. Nisbet, ‘The *Invectiva in Ciceronem* and *Epistula Secunda* of Pseudo-Sallust’, *JRS* 48 (1958), 30–2.

³⁰ [Quint. 4.1.68, 9.3.89.]

³¹ Asc. 30.8–9.

³² Sall. *Hist.* 4.51 [= 56 McG. = 51 R.].

³³ Plut. *Crass.* 12.

³⁴ Sall. *Hist.* 4.51 [= 56 McG. = 51 R.: ‘Crassus was more preoccupied with criticising his colleague than with rigorously assessing what was good and what was bad for the people’]. Cf. W. Clausen, ‘Notes on Sallust’s *Historiae*’, *AJP* 68 (1947), 293–301, at 297–8.

Sallust's List of Conspirators

[1] Sallust furnishes an assembly of conspirators at the home of Catilina shortly before the election in 64, and a harangue from their leader. The whole contrivance is vulnerable to criticism. Catilina announces a programme that involves revolutionary violence—and the insistence on the word *bellum*.¹ Yet no recourse to open violent measures (it is clear) would be needed so long as a man hoped to achieve his consulship. The conspiracy is patently the result of Catilina's second failure in 63. Moreover, a dark suspicion arises. Is not Sallust using for model, and transplacing, the notorious *contio domestica* that belongs to the electoral season of 63?

Sallust's list of fifteen conspirators (eleven senators and four knights) will prove variously instructive. The following are the names:²

Senators: P. Lentulus Sura, P. Autronius, L. Cassius Longinus, C. Cethegus, P. and Ser. Sulla Ser. filii, L. Vargunteius, Q. Annius, M. Porcius Laeca, L. Bestia, Q. Curius.

Knights: M. Fulvius Nobilior, L. Statilius, P. Gabinius Capito, C. Cornelius.

In establishing this list, what principles is the author likely to be working upon? On a negative criterion, he would not wish to include characters who fail to recur in the narrative. And, in fact, only two of them miss any mentioning again, viz. P. Sulla Ser. f. and the knight M. Fulvius Nobilior. On the other hand, no compulsion or advantage in registering various persons who turn up in the sequel, most of them sporadic and of minor rank or consequence.

[2] Next, his means of information. If no other source, orations of Cicero were to hand. In the first instance, the *Third Catilinarian*. A single passage was very valuable. It gave the names of those taken into custody consequent on the affair of the Allobroges, viz. Lentulus, Cethegus, Statilius, Gabinius. Also five more, to be apprehended, viz. L. Cassius Longinus, M. Caeparius, P. Furius, Q. Annius Chilo, and P. Umbrenus.³

¹ Sall. *Cat.* 20.16 (*belli spolia magnifica*); 31.1–2.

² [Sall. *Cat.* 17.3–4.]

³ [Cic. *Cat.* 3.15.]

Of these five two are on Sallust's list: L. Cassius and Annius (without the *cognomen*). And the others are repeated in his narrative. A word may be spared for their subsequent fate. M. Caeparius was arrested without delay.⁴ He suffered the death penalty along with Lentulus, Cethegus, Statilius, and Gabinius. As for P. Furius, Cicero states that he was a colonist at Faesulae. It has been conjectured that he was the unnamed *Faesulanum quendam* who commanded the right wing of Catilina's army at Pistoriae and perished in the battle.⁵ There is nothing on record about the senator Annius or about P. Umbrenus (whom Cicero styles a freedman).⁶ And the aristocratic Cassius evades notice, who had been a consular candidate in 64—a fat man, who at that time seemed *stolidus tum magis quam improbus*.⁷ Cassius had been careful not to give any written pledge to the Allobroges, but their testimony implicated him. He left Rome shortly before they set out.⁸

[3] Nine names now remain on Sallust's lists: cursory inspection of a page early in the *Pro Sulla* reveals six, the victims of prosecutions in the court *de vi publica*. They are L. Vargunteius, P. Autronius Paetus, Ser. Sulla and P. Sulla (sons of Ser. Sulla), M. Porcius Laeca, C. Cornelius.⁹ How deep were some of them in it?

Three are left. One eliminates himself, Q. Curius, the traitor who secured immunity—but was cheated of his reward when he tried to incriminate Caesar in 62.¹⁰ Next, the knight with a name redolent of history, M. Fulvius Nobilior. Complete silence envelops him, until a casual notice attests his condemnation in 54. His trial may have brought up damaging allegations—and Sallust may have known the case and the man, hence the inclusion. There is a chance that Nobilior may be the Fulvius with Caesar in 48, described by Cicero as *mihi inimicissimus*.¹¹ Sallust had a certain interest in the Fulvii, a great dynastic house of the plebeian *nobilitas* now in decay, but high in notoriety.¹²

Last, L. Calpurnius Bestia, tribune of the plebs in 62. This item is so peculiar and revealing that it demands a separate treatment.¹³

[4] S[allust] shoved in Bestia. Why not P. Sulla also? Sallust adopted the Ciceronian version of the plot in 66 which substituted Catilina for Sulla.¹⁴ That was most important. Ciceronian eloquence or the fact that Sulla was acquitted in 62 might not alone have been enough to keep Sulla off Sallust's list, if Sallust wanted him there. A personal reason may have intervened. Sallust can hardly have failed to know Sulla in 47 in the preliminaries of the African campaign when they each had trouble with mutinous troops.¹⁵

⁴ Sall. *Cat.* 47.4.

⁵ Sall. *Cat.* 59.3; 60.6. [See Münzer, *RE* VII, 1, 317 (Furius no. 23).]

⁶ [Cic. *Cat.* 3.14.]

⁷ Asc. 82.14 ['daft, rather than dishonest']; see also Cic. *Cat.* 3.16.

⁸ Sall. *Cat.* 44.2; cf. Cic. *Cat.* 3.9.

⁹ Cic. *Sull.* 6–7.

¹⁰ Suet. *DJ* 17.

¹¹ Cic. *Att.* 4.18.3. Cf. Shackleton-Bailey on *Att.* 11.8.2: *Fufius est illic, mihi inimicissimus*.

¹² [Sall. *Cat.* 17.4, 23.3–4, 26.3, 28.2, 39.5.]

¹³ [Cf. no. 10, 'Sallust and Bestia'.]

¹⁴ [Sall. *Cat.* 18.]

¹⁵ [MRR 2.281, 290.]

For the rest, one might be tempted to deplore the absence of the two Claudii Marcelli, father and son (to be sharply distinguished from the relatives of P. Sulla).¹⁶ Extolling the services of P. Sestius (quaestor to Antonius in 63), Cicero states that he drove a certain C. Marcellus away from Capua, where he was tampering with gladiators.¹⁷ A later writer reports an incident in the aftermath of the conspiracy—the insurrection of the two Marcelli, father and son, in the Paelignian country. It was revealed by L. Vettius and put down by the praetor M. Calpurnius Bibulus.¹⁸ It is much to be regretted that those aristocratic desperados baffle identification. It is a period when, after eclipse, some of their luckier kinsmen were on the way to three consulates (51, 50, 49).

¹⁶ Cic. *Sull.* 19.

¹⁷ Cic. *Sest.* 9.

¹⁸ Oros. 6.6.7.

P. Sulla (*cos. cand.* 66 BC)

[1] P. Sulla enjoys abundant notoriety—and perhaps excessive. Along with P. Autronius Paetus he won the elections in 66, but both were indicted for *ambitus* and condemned, Torquatus and Cotta taking their place.¹ Sulla, if anybody, ought to have been in a plot (supposing it existed) to assassinate the new consuls when they entered upon office.

Cicero in a letter to Pompeius professed that there was a direct link between that affair and the conspiracy of Catilina.² Hence a challenge to his skill as an advocate when he agreed to undertake the defence of P. Sulla in 62. To exculpate Sulla from complicity with Catilina in 63 or at any time earlier, he used various devices. He heaped discredit on Autronius, that violent character; he argued that Sulla was quiet, honourable, and decorous; and he smuggled Catilina into the ostensible plot at the end of 66.³

Cicero's version prevailed in the sequel. The historian Sallust accepted it, uncritically. P. Sulla has no share in the abortive actions of January 1 and February 5, 65, as retailed by Sallust in a digression.⁴ Nor does his name stand on the roll call of the conspirators assembled in the house of Catilina in 64.⁵

Deceit, mendacity, and credulity are on show. One needs facts. This man was a nephew of the Sulla the Dictator. That is stated by Cassius Dio.⁶ No occasion to doubt, or suggest a confusion somewhere with a homonym, one of the two brothers who happen to occur on Sallust's list of conspirators in 64—*P. et Ser. Sullae, Ser. filii*.⁷ Further, at Sulla's trial a certain Messalla interceded on his behalf.⁸ Presumably M. [2] Messalla Rufus (*pr.* 61, *cos.* 53), brother of Valeria, that young divorcée whom the Dictator took as his fifth and last wife.⁹ Hortensius, speaking in partnership with Cicero with P. Sulla, was the maternal uncle of Messalla Rufus.¹⁰

¹ Sources in *MRR* 2.157.

² *Cic. Sull.* 67; *Schol. Bob.* 167.22–30 St.

³ *Cic. Sull.* 15–16.

⁴ *Sall. Cat.* 18–19.

⁵ *Sall. Cat.* 17.3–4.

⁶ *Cass. Dio* 36.44.3.

⁷ *Sall. Cat.* 17.3.

⁸ *Cic. Sull.* 20.1.

⁹ *Vell.* 2.27; *Plut. Sull.* 35.

¹⁰ *Val. Max.* 5.9.2.

The father of P. Sulla lacks attestation. His mother married again: L. Caecilius L. f. Rufus, tribune of the plebs in 63, praetor in 57, is the half-brother of P. Sulla.¹¹

Of Sulla's career and occupations down to his candidature in 66, nothing is on record after his establishment of the Dictator's colony of veterans at Pompeii. A neglected fact is to hand, which opens some perspectives: the identity of his wife.

There was a sister of Pompeius, married to a certain Memmius. After his rapid conquest of Sicily in 81, the young general left Memmius in charge of the island. He was later in Spain. Described as the quaestor of Pompeius, he fell in the battle at the river Turia in 75.¹²

The match produced a son, C. Memmius, tribune of the plebs in 54. What provision was made for the widow? Some fancy that she may be discovered as the Pompeia who is attested long after, in 45, as the second wife of P. Vatinius.¹³ Not plausible—and in fact false. Pompeia found a husband quite soon, by 70 at the latest. It was none other than P. Sulla.¹⁴

The fact is established by an odd item in a letter of Cicero. In October of 54 P. Sulla instituted a prosecution against Gabinius—*subscribente privigno Memmio, fratre Caecilio, Sulla filio*.¹⁵ A family party, and precious evidence: Sulla's stepson, his half-brother, and his own son. That son [3] must already have assumed the *toga virilis*, hence clear evidence about the date of Sulla's marriage to the sister of Magnus.

What emerges? Even if, as can happen, there supervened estrangement or enmity later on, that alliance ought to have brought benefit to P. Sulla, for a time at least, in the career of honours. One would wish to know about his experience with the armies and the date of his praetorship (it was 68 at the latest). When he stood for the consulate with Autronius, that was patently against the Optimates—who, however, were able to reverse the verdict of the polls. Autronius, it can be argued, was an adherent of Crassus.¹⁶ But men looked also to the prestige of Pompeius, though absent, and to his influence. Was not P. Sulla his candidate?

Whatever view may be held about rancour or plotting after the prosecution of 66, P. Sulla comported himself with discretion—so at least Cicero asserts.¹⁷ He led a quiet life at Naples. Indeed, when in 63 Caecilius Rufus, moved by fraternal piety, came forward with a bill to alleviate the disabilities of persons condemned for *ambitus*, Sulla induced him to drop it. Further, he

¹¹ Cic. *Sull.* 62. ¹² Oros. 5.23.12.

¹³ Cic. *Fam.* 5.11.2. Cf. *RE* XXI, 2264 (Pompeius no. 56).

¹⁴ *RE* XV, 616 (Memmius no. 9).

¹⁵ Cic. *Q. Fr.* 3.3.2 ['with his stepson Memmius, his brother Caecilius, and his son Sulla as junior prosecutors'].

¹⁶ Cf. ['Crassus, Catilina and the Vestal Virgins', no. 14].

¹⁷ Cic. *Sull.* 17, 53.

authorised the praetor Metellus Celer to proclaim before the Senate what his feelings were.¹⁸

In spite of his exemplary conduct, Sulla appeared vulnerable after the conspiracy of Catilina (Autronius had been in it), and he was prosecuted by the son of Manlius Torquatus. His riches, his friends, and the best advocates of the day rescued him from the ordeal. After that, he lapses from record for eight years—for it is hardly of significance that Clodius, worsted in a riot in November of 57, took refuge in [4] the mansion of Sulla.¹⁹

However, in October of 54 he indicts Gabinius. Perhaps the interval of leisure had whetted his ambition. His ally was the stepson C. Memmius, now taking a stand against the adherent of Pompeius Magnus, and indeed already hostile long since to his uncle, if Cicero is to be trusted. At least he states, exhorting Memmius, *senatus cuius auctoritati te ab adolescentia dedisti*.²⁰

Next, the Civil War, and a paradox. Now over sixty, and with no military talent on record, Sulla rendered notable service to Caesar, defending the camp at Dyrrachium—and he commands the right wing at the Battle of Pharsalus.²¹ With him went the luck of Sulla Felix.

He was not so happy the next year. The troops assembling for the African campaign were fractious and recalcitrant. In Campania Sallust nearly perished in a mutiny.²² In fact, two praetors were killed. Sulla is appropriately discovered in the company of his old friend, the consular Messalla Rufus (*cos.* 53), like himself a victim of *ambitus*, vainly defended in 51 by Hortensius.²³ At Messana, the soldiers repulsed Sulla and Messalla. They threw stones at them.²⁴

Sallust had employment in the African campaign, though not in the field.²⁵ Messalla, however, had a cavalry command.²⁶ But no word of P. Sulla.

At the end of December, 46, cheerful news came to Cicero. Sulla was dead. Brigands had killed him, or over-eating, it was not certain.²⁷

In due course Cicero was able to discharge various resentments on the dead man. Attacking Caesar's measures, he de[5]scribed Sulla as a shameless profiteer from two dictatorships.²⁸ He chose to forget his laudation of Sulla's correct and compassionate behaviour in the season of the Proscriptions—*quis P. Sulla mitior, quis misericordior inventus est?*²⁹ And it is only a late and

¹⁸ Cic. *Sull.* 65.

¹⁹ Cic. *Att.* 4.3.3.

²⁰ Cic. *Rab. Post.* 7 ['the Senate, to whose authority you have devoted yourself since your youth'].

²¹ Caes. *BC* 3.89.3.

²² App. *BC* 2.92; Cass. Dio 42.53.1–2.

²³ Cic. *Brut.* 328; *Fam.* 8.2.1, 8.4.1; *Att.* 5.12.2; Val. Max. 5.9.2.

²⁴ Cic. *Att.* 11.21.2 and 22.2.

²⁵ *Bell. Afr.* 8.3, 34.1–2, 97.1.

²⁶ *Bell. Afr.* 86.

²⁷ Cic. *Fam.* 15.17.2.

²⁸ Cic. *Fam.* 15.17.2, 9.10.3.

²⁹ Cic. *Sull.* 72.4 ['who has come across someone kinder and more compassionate than P. Sulla?'].

casual notice that reveals the huge fee that Cicero took for his defence, in guise of a loan.³⁰

The son, P. Sulla (attested in 54), survived his opulent and disliked parent. For how long, there is no sign. By craft and subservience anybody could win honour from the Triumvirs, so Sallust affirmed, in just acerbity.³¹ The names of their consuls are variously instructive, some commended by military commands but others unobtrusive. The son of Autronius emerges, not attested before his consulate (*suff.* 33). Likewise a C. Memmius. He is either the tribune of 54, the stepson of Sulla, or a son of C. Memmius (*pr.* 58) and Fausta, the Dictator's daughter.³² But no P. Sulla in this period.

The next generation brings a tardy compensation—L. Cornelius P. f. Sulla (*cos.* 5 BC). Praetor, consul, and *septemvir epulonum*, otherwise only a name.³³ Further and finally, the last of the line is perhaps that Cornelius Sulla who is briefly registered in a group of deleterious senators encouraged or compelled to vacate their places by Tiberius Caesar in AD 17. They are designated as *prodigi et ob flagitia egentes*.³⁴

³⁰ Gell. 12.2.2–4.

³¹ Sall. *Jug.* 3.3.

³² Autronius: *RE* II, 2, 2612 (Autronius, no. 6); Memmius: for the latter option see *RE* XV, 1, 618 (Memmius, no. 10).

³³ *RE* IV, 1, 1517 (Cornelius, no. 380).

³⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 2.48.3 [‘prodigal, and impoverished by their outrageous conduct].

The Gay Sempronia

[1] In the narrative of the *Bellum Catilinae* the historian Sallust, while mentioning not a few persons by name, condescends to depict in high relief and bright colours four characters only. First the protagonist, the patrician L. Sergius Catilina; then the contrasted figures of Caesar and Cato, diverse in morals and habits of life but standing as sublime types of *virtus* in days when *virtus* was rare enough. The fourth character is not Cicero, coolly designated as *optimus consul* [*Cat.* 43.1], but a woman, Sempronia, of various and resplendent talents, none turned to any good use. Sempronia possessed a masculine understanding, exquisite culture, and a ready wit; certain of her accomplishments displayed more grace than an honest woman needs. Avid, audacious, and extravagant, this lady of quality took what she wanted, careless of reputation: she had boldly repudiated pledges and debts, she had even been privy to murder.¹

The portrait was intended to bite into the mind and memory of the reader. When Tacitus drew the character of Seianus in a brief sequence of strong sharp phrases, recalling Sallust's Catilina, he paid thereby a very proper compliment to the master of Roman historical style.² Likewise his picture of the seductive Poppaea Sabina, modelled upon Sempronia, but not with slavish imitation. There are verbal echoes; but the perfect Sallustian phrase with which Tacitus achieved his opening effect, bare, plain, and archaic, owes nothing to the original—*huic mulieri cuncta alia fuere praeter honestum animum*.³

Such was the female counterpart to Catilina. It comes as something of a shock to the earnest student when he realises that Sempronia, led on the stage in pomp and splendour, takes no part at all in the action: her house was used on one occasion, for a meeting when and because her husband was away from Rome.⁴ Sallust enjoys and deserves the reputation of a careful and

[1] ¹ Sall. *Cat.* 25.1: *sed in iis erat Sempronia, quae multa saepe virilis audaciae facinora commiserat* etc. ['among these was Sempronia, who had often carried out deeds of manly daring...'].

² Tac. *Ann.* 4.1.

³ Tac. *Ann.* 13.45.2 ['this woman had everything else, except an honest character'].

⁴ Sall. *Cat.* 40.5: *ille eos in domum D. Bruti perducit, quod foro propinqua erat neque aliena consili propter Semproniam; nam tum Brutus ab Roma aberat* ['He took them to the house of

economical writer. He has lavished the resources of his art upon this woman. To what end?

[2] When Sallust enters known and recorded history, it is as an enemy of the dominant group in the oligarchy, the *factio optimatum*. Conspicuous among the tribunes who fomented disorder after the murder of Clodius in 52, he was expelled from the Senate by the Censors two years later: of the censorial pair, the more active partner (who tried in vain to remove Curio) was the proud and bigoted Ap. Claudius Pulcher. Sallust, the contemporary of Curio and of Caelius, is a member of that *perdita iuventus* of the fifties which ended by gravitating so naturally towards Caesar. Not only that. There was a personal reason. The parvenu from the *municipium* of Amiternum in the Sabine land had no doubt, like the eminent consular from Arpinum, suffered affront and rebuffs from the *nobiles*. He knew the meaning of *Appietas* and *Lentulitas*.

Sallust was no crude apologist for Caesar, no dreary panegyrist. His methods were subtle and deadly. Tracing the decline of morality in the Roman State he begins, as did others, with the fall of Carthage, Rome's only remaining rival of empire in the world. But he concentrates upon Sulla and the restored oligarchy of Sulla as the true source of evil; and he does his best to demonstrate that Catilina is only a natural product of so corrupt a system. The nobility, so Sallust argues, has forfeited all right to its station and privileges; it is enslaved to money and luxury; it is incompetent as well as immoral. Hence the malignant care with which the historian attaches the label of noble birth to Catilina, to certain of his associates, or to other disreputable characters;⁵ and Cato in his oration exclaims *coniuravere nobilissimi cives*.⁶ Indeed, by a diabolical device, Cato the champion of the oligarchy (and martyr of the Republic) is made to pronounce the final and damning verdict on the inertia and corruption of the governing order.⁷

Sallust introduces Sempronia as one of a group of society ladies, of expensive ladies, whose age no longer permitted them to turn their charms to financial profit. With the help of this cohort of veteran mondaines Catilina hoped to raise the slaves of Rome, promote incendiarism—and win over or kill their husbands.⁸ It might therefore appear [3] that Sallust has chosen Sempronia simply as the female archetype of brilliant corruption among the nobility, the 'woman of the period', uniting in her single person, with some suitable enhancements, the qualities found in such great ladies as Clodia and Servilia—and perhaps Postumia, the powerful wife of Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, if we only know. No other contemporary mentions this pearl and paragon among women. Like Catilina, she has been built up by a subtle and artistic historian.

D. Brutus, because it was near the forum and no stranger to the scheme because of Sempronia; Brutus was away from Rome at the time'.

⁵ Sall. *Cat.* 5.1 (Catilina); 18.4 (Cn. Piso); 21.1 (Fulvia); 43.2 (potential patricides); 55.6 (Lentulus).

⁶ Sall. *Cat.* 52.24 ['the most noble citizens have conspired'].

⁷ Sall. *Cat.* 52.5–12; 19–23.

⁸ Sall. *Cat.* 24.3.

That explanation has not satisfied everybody. The loves and the crimes of Sempronia are lost to scandal and lost to history. But a detail that might have seemed of scant relevance to her activities is preserved—the name of her husband. He was D. Junius Brutus (*cos.* 77), an elderly person, and never conspicuous. Hence a hypothesis. It has been supposed that Sallust gave prominence to Sempronia not for her own sake or merely for decorative purposes, but for a precise reason, because she was the mother of one of the assassins of Caesar, namely Decimus Brutus.⁹ That young man enjoyed beyond others the favour of Caesar; he had served in the Gallic Wars, from 56 if not from 58; in the Civil Wars Caesar seems to have shown him special regard, by permitting him not to fight against fellow-citizens. Designated for consul in 42, D. Brutus was one of the residuary legatees in the Dictator's last will and testament. In spite of all this, Brutus, conspiring with Pompeians and Republicans, murdered his leader and benefactor. His decision was perhaps of greater significance than the action of Marcus Brutus, who was Cato's nephew and had a just cause to avenge; and the Caesarians appear to have felt more bitter resentment against Decimus. Especially Marcus Antonius, as is shown by a passage from one of his despatches.¹⁰ Therefore Sallust, like a loyal Caesarian partisan, shows up the mother of the assassin.

The family and origin of Sempronia still evades detection. An exciting guess has been hazarded. It is suggested that Sempronia was no other person than a daughter of the great revolutionary tribune C. Gracchus.¹¹ After all, she need not have been too old, not more than [4] sixty (C. Gracchus was killed in 121). It is true that no source mentions a daughter of C. Gracchus; her existence (and such a woman as that) might have been expected to leave some trace in the well-documented annals of the age of Pompeius and Caesar. Sallust does not indicate the remarkable and relevant fact of her ancestry. Whatever else be thought, and whatever the identity, the silence of Sallust need not be in itself an objection. In an oligarchic society, everybody knows about family relationships—and behaves accordingly. Some of the most important facts of consanguinity or alliance are never recorded where relevant. They are often transmitted to posterity only by accident. It may be taken that Sallust's readers knew who Sempronia was.

* * *

An unattested daughter of C. Gracchus will not be accepted save in default of other claimants to notoriety. Is there available no woman in the line and descent of the Sempronii Tuditani? When the consul C. Sempronius Tuditanus campaigned against the Japudes in 129, his legate was an experienced soldier of

⁹ E. Schwartz, 'Die Berichte über die catilinarische Verschwörung', *Hermes* 32 (1897), 570 = *Gesammelte Schriften* II (Berlin 1956) 293–4. He was not the first to promulgate this opinion, which has been widely accepted, cf. F. Münzer, *RA* 272; K. Latte, 'Sallust', *Neue Wege zum Antike* II, 4 (Leipzig and Berlin 1935) 31.

[2] ¹⁰ Quoted by Cicero, *Phil.* 13.25: *ut venefica haec liberetur obsidione* ['so that this viper is liberated from a siege'].

¹¹ Münzer, *RA* 272–3; *RE* II A, 1446.

consular rank, D. Junius Brutus Callaicus (*cos.* 138), the father of the already mentioned consul of 77: Callaicus gets the credit.¹² There may well have been some tie of family or politics between the two. The affinities of Brutus seem to lie with the supporters of the Gracchi and with the enemies of Scipio Aemilianus (categories often but not always identical). He was certainly a kinsman of M. Aemilius Lepidus Porcina (*cos.* 137).¹³ Further, a marriage brought him into the group of Ap. Claudius Pulcher (*cos.* 143).

After the death of the *pontifex maximus* P. Licinius Crassus Mucianus in 130, Brutus took the widow to wife, Clodia, and so became the stepfather-in-law of C. Gracchus.¹⁴ This relationship did not, it is true, prevent him from taking a hand in the suppression of C. Gracchus.¹⁵ Political developments of this order might well cut across the ties of blood and family.

About the politics of Tuditanus there is no certainty. It is commonly assumed that he was a partisan of Aemilianus, and an enemy of the Gracchan faction.¹⁶ That may only be an inference from his behaviour [5] in 129. As a result of the intervention of Aemilianus, the judicial functions of the Gracchan agrarian commissioners were removed and assigned to the consuls; and the consul Tuditanus, so it is said, evaded the task (and frustrated the activities of the reformers) by departing to make war in Illyria.¹⁷

That account may not carry and reveal the full story of Tuditanus' political allegiance. A past connection with the Claudii might be deduced from the fact that a Claudius and a Sempronius Tuditanus had been consular colleagues twice in the past, in 240 and in 185. It may be argued that M. Tuditanus (*cos.* 185) would hardly have thought of putting forward his candidature for the censorship in the following year against eight illustrious and senior contestants without the support of the two Claudii, the consuls precisely of 185 and 184.¹⁸ Further, in 130, the year of C. Tuditanus' election, the Gracchan party was still strong, being able to impose an Appius Claudius as consul suffect after the death of L. Lentulus. The other consul of 130 was M. Perperna, certainly of Claudian allegiance.¹⁹ If a consul after his election disappointed the expectations of his supporters, that is no matter for surprise or scandal. A few years later, C. Gracchus had an unhappy experience with C. Fannius (*cos.* 122), who most inconsiderately turned against him.²⁰

This was the last consul of the Tuditani—or, for that matter, of any line of the Sempronii before the Republic ended. He left, so far as is known, a son and a daughter. The daughter married L. Hortensius and so became the mother of the famous orator, Q. Hortensius (*cos.* 69).²¹ Tuditanus the son is alleged to

¹² Livy *Per.* 59.

¹³ App. *Iber.* 80.350, cf. Münzer, *RA* 241–[3].

¹⁴ Cf. Münzer, *RA* 270–1, elucidating the testimony of Nepos (in Plut. *Tib. Gracch.* 21).

¹⁵ Oros. 5.12.7.

¹⁶ Thus Münzer, *RE* II A, 1441.

¹⁷ App. *BC* 1.19.

¹⁸ Livy 39.40–1.

¹⁹ Münzer, *RA* 192–3.

²⁰ Plut. *C. Gracch.* 8.

²¹ Cic. *Att.* 13.6.4, etc.

have been a megalomaniac;²² his daughter married the stupid and ridiculous M. Fulvius Bambalio;²³ and their child was the famous Fulvia, married in succession to Clodius, to Curio, and to Marcus Antonius. Fulvia's mother, designated as *Sempronia Tuditani filia* was still alive in 52 BC.²⁴

If D. Brutus (*cos.* 77), reinforcing an earlier tie between Junii and Sempronii, took to wife a Sempronia of the Tuditani, where is she to be sought? Hardly a daughter of C. Sempronius Tuditanus (*cos.* 129), but rather a granddaughter, for Brutus himself was the son of an elderly [6] father.²⁵ That is to say, his wife was not an aunt of Hortensius (who was born in 114), but a cousin. It might therefore be conjectured that Brutus married a Sempronia who was perhaps Bambalio's widow.

Another possibility offers. No testimony affirms that Sempronia, the consul's wife in 63, was in fact the mother of Decimus Brutus. That young man was probably born about 81.²⁶ He might have been the product of an earlier marriage. Now sporadic literary evidence reveals the fact that D. Brutus bore an additional *cognomen*, *Albinus*.²⁷ On the normal practice, no problem: it indicates a Postumius Albinus adopted by a Junius Brutus. However, Decimus on coins styled himself *Albinus Bruti f.*²⁸ There is a parallel—*Lent. Mar. f.*, that is to say, a Claudius Marcellus adopted by a Cornelius Lentulus.²⁹ Therefore one has to assume that Decimus was adopted by a Postumius Albinus.³⁰ Kinship often explains an adoption. Thus did Marcus Brutus acquire the nomenclature *Q. Caepio Brutus* from his mother's brother, Q. Servilius Caepio.³¹

The mother of Decimus Brutus might therefore be a Postumia, perhaps a sister of Postumia, the wife of the jurist Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (*cos.* 51)—no other link is known between Junii and Postumii. Cicero describes the son of Ser. Sulpicius as a *consobrinus* of Decimus.³² Further, when going into a matter of family history and personal survivals, Cicero affirms that Postumia would be sure to know whether or no Clodia, the mother of the consul of 77, outlived her son.³³ On that showing, Sempronia would not be the mother, but the stepmother of D. Brutus, conspirator and assassin.

²² Cic. *Phil.* 3.16, etc. [Cic. *Acad.* 2.89; Val. Max. 7.8.1; Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 3.23.]

²³ Cic. *Phil.* 2.90; 3.16, etc. ²⁴ Asc. 35.40.

²⁵ The marriage of his parents Callaicus (*cos.* 138) and Clodia will belong not long after 131. [3] ²⁶ Cf. Münzer, *RE* Suppl. V, 370, no. 55a.

²⁷ Plut. *Crass.* 24; Cass. Dio 44.14.3, etc.

²⁸ *BMCRR* 1.507 [–509, 512, nos. 3962–72, 3987–8] = Sydenham, *RRC* 158 [nos. 941–4 = Crawford, *RRC* 1.466–7, nos. 450–1].

²⁹ *BMCRR* 1.233–[36, nos. 1704–24] = Sydenham *RRC* 86 [no. 604–6 = Crawford, *RRC* 1.329–30, no. 329], cf. *RE* IV, 1390. Observe also *Scipio Lepidi filius* (Orosius 5.22.7), a son of M. Aemilius Lepidus (*cos.* 78), or L. Sempronius Atratinus recorded as Βησσία υἱός (*ILS* 9491: Hypata), i.e., the son of L. Calpurnius Bestia (*tr. pl.* 62).

³⁰ [*RE* 369–70, Suppl. V, no. 55a.]

³¹ Thus Münzer, *RE* Suppl. V, 369. ³² Cic. *Fam.* 11.7.1.

³³ Cic. *Att.* 12.22.2. On Münzer's showing, Postumius would have no tie of blood with the family of D. Brutus.

It would thus be open to argue that D. Junius Brutus (*cos.* 77), having a son by a Postumia, married again, taking over Sempronia, widowed (or divorced) from M. Fulvius Bambalio. If that were so, Fulvia would be the consul's stepdaughter. Fulvia might be supposed born about 75. A malicious imputation of Cicero in the *Philippics* implies that she was the wife of Clodius as early as his tribunate in 58;³⁴ and she had given him two children by 52.³⁵

[7] The mention of P. Clodius Pulcher imports a perplexity about his wife or wives. Cicero in a speech of September of the year 57, referring to the events of 58, alludes to the wife of Clodius: she was a sister of the young patrician L. Pinarius Natta.³⁶ Hence the standard and impeachable assumption that the first wife of P. Clodius (before Fulvia) was a Pinaria.³⁷ This Pinaria, not authenticated anywhere by that *nomen*, must have died in the course of 58 because Clodius was married to Fulvia before the year's end.

That assumption can be overturned. A neat conjecture has been produced to simplify matters—and abolish Pinaria.³⁸ The anonymous sister of L. Pinarius Natta might be in fact no other than Fulvia, hence only his half-sister. Now Natta's mother was married to L. Licinius Murena (*cos.* 62);³⁹ and Fulvia's mother was called Sempronia.⁴⁰ Hence the reconstruction: Sempronia, *Tuditani filia*, was married three times, to a Pinarius Natta (unattested), to M. Fulvius Bambalio, to L. Licinius Murena.

It is difficult to resist this conclusion, and it is pleasing to discover Fulvia active in politics at her first known emergence. At least Cicero, to play down the role of Natta in 58, grows eloquent about his youth and inexperience, emphasising a sister's entreaties and the menaces of a powerful mother.⁴¹

In 63 the mother of Pinarius (and therefore of Fulvia) was the wife of Murena.⁴² It therefore becomes permissible to conjecture that the Sempronia in Sallust is an unattested sister of that formidable Sempronia, *Tuditani filia*.

Through Sempronia, it has been asserted, Sallust, like a loyal Caesarian partisan, was attacking her son, D. Brutus.⁴³ The notion in itself is easy and attractive. Various reasons counsel a doubt. First, Decimus was perhaps not Sempronia's son, but (as has above been suggested) the son of a Postumia. Next, and apart from that hypothesis, it ought to have been noticed that Sallust refers [8] to children of Sempronia—but with no hint of hostility, rather the

³⁴ Cic. *Phil.* 2.48. [4] ³⁵ Asc. 35.7–8 (a son); Suet. *Aug.* 62.1 (a daughter).

³⁶ Cic. *Dom.* 118, 134, 139. ³⁷ *RE* XX, 1407.

³⁸ L. R. Taylor, 'Caesar's Colleagues in the Pontifical College', *AJP* 63 (1942), 385–412, at 396 n. 34.

³⁹ Cic. *Mur.* 73; cf. *Dom.* 134. ⁴⁰ Asc. 40.19.

⁴¹ Cic. *Dom.* 118: *soror rogavit, mater coegit* ['the sister asked him, his mother compelled him']; 139: *sororis precibus, matris minis adductus* ['led by the prayers of his sister and the threats of his mother'].

⁴² Cic. *Mur.* 73. ⁴³ [Cf. e.g. Schwartz, 'Die Berichte', cit.]

reverse.⁴⁴ Lastly, Sallust in the *Bellum Catilinae* is defending Caesar from aspersions and misrepresentations. That cannot be denied.⁴⁵ What is in question is his integrity or bias. But further, his political allegiance. It is not at all clear that the man who composed this monograph is to be regarded as a thorough partisan—or bitter and revengeful against each and every one of the assassins. And again, would Caesar have liked Sallust's parallel between Cato and Caesar?⁴⁶

There is something else. Decimus Brutus was detested by loyal Caesarians. But Decimus did not hold the stage for long after the siege and relief [9] of Mutina. In the summer of the year 43 the generals of the western provinces made common cause with Marcus Antonius. D. Brutus, lured on and deceived by Plancus, abandoned his army and perished in flight somewhere in the Alpine lands. In the meantime, however, momentous events—in August Octavianus marched on Rome and seized the consulate; he allied himself with Antonius and Lepidus; in November the Triumvirate was established and the proscriptions began. People lost interest in D. Brutus.

Perhaps Sallust was aiming higher. The date at which he composed the *Bellum Catilinae* cannot be determined with any precision. It is sometimes supposed that the monograph was composed to refute and discredit the revelations furnished by Cicero's secret history of his own times, the *De consiliis suis*.⁴⁷ The tract was published, so Cassius Dio states, after Cicero's death, by his son.⁴⁸ However that may be, Sallust was anything but a rapid composer. The *Bellum Catilinae* need not have been terminated before the end of the following year, 42 BC, the year of Philippi. Nor is the subsequent epoch of troubles in Italy culminating in the War of Perusia (winter 41/40) excluded.⁴⁹

In any event, Sallust's first historical work is much more than a refutation of Cicero's *De consiliis*; and, if D. Brutus is allowed to lapse from interest, a new perspective opens. The *Bellum Catilinae* may contain some details relevant to the new masters of Rome. Sallust's subsequent description of the deplorable

⁴⁴ Sall. Cat. 25.2: *haec mulier genere atque forma, praeterea viro atque liberis satis fortunata fuit* ['this woman was pretty fortunate in her lineage and appearance, and in her husband and children besides'].

⁴⁵ Cf. the temperate observation of H. M. Last, 'Sallust and Caesar in the *Bellum Catilinae*', in *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à J. Marouzeau* (Paris 1948) 355–69.

⁴⁶ As the sagacious Boissier pointed out, *La conjuration de Catilina* (Paris 1905) 13.

⁴⁷ E. Schwartz, 'Die Berichte über die catilinarische Verschwörung', *Hermes* 32 (1897), 557–58 = *Gesammelte Schriften* II (1956), 279–80. His view that the tract is identical with his *Ἀνέκδοτα* is reasonable.

[5] ⁴⁸ Cass. Dio 39.10.2–3.

⁴⁹ H. M. Last argues that his monograph was completed only in 42 (o.c. 360). For a later date, Boissier, *Conjuration*, 6.

character of politics in Rome under the despotism is well known;⁵⁰ and his own explanation asserts and justifies a voluntary retirement from public life (presumably after the assassination of Caesar).⁵¹ He had enough of it all. And, let it be added, he had made his pile. It needed little prescience to understand that the game of politics would soon become hazardous and murderous.

Of Sallust's relations with the leading men in the Caesarian party, [10] there is no evidence.⁵² The wealthy ex-governor of Africa must have made enemies, but he enjoyed protection of some kind and evaded proscription. In 42 the Triumvir's discredited uncle C. Antonius, emerging like a ghost from the Catilinarian past, was appointed to the office of censor.⁵³ He cannot have liked the remarks in Sallust's monograph; and the terms in which Sallust spoke of Creticus (*pr.* 74) some years later in the *Histories* will have caused no gratification to the son of Creticus, the Triumvir.⁵⁴

Antonius, however, was most vulnerable through his wife Fulvia. In the winter of 44/43 her ancestry was deluged with publicity. Antonius had impugned not the morals only but the family of the young Octavianus—his mother came from the small town of Aricia. Cicero, retorting, pointed to Tusculum, the home of the Fulvii, and spoke with contempt of Fulvia's father and grandfather, Bambalio and Tuditanus, ridiculous creatures of noble birth—*habetis nobilitatem generis gloriosam*.⁵⁵

Sallust heard these words delivered or read them subsequently. He hardly needed a reminder of the facts, which were notorious. The decline of government and families excites his passionate and personal interest. Conspicuous among the decayed *nobiles* are the connected houses of the Fulvii and Sempronii. The prominence of the Fulvian name in the narrative of the *Bellum Catilinae* is surely not accidental—Fulvia the spy, who supplied Cicero with information, designated as *mulier nobilis*, M. Fulvius Nobilior of equestrian rank, and Fulvius, the son of a senator.⁵⁶ As for the notorious Sempronia, in 63 married to D. Brutus (*cos.* 77), she is perhaps the daughter of Tuditanus, and the aunt of Fulvia.

In the year 52 the person of the spy Fulvia could still attract public notice, as a scandalous anecdote reveals.⁵⁷ A minor official, one of the *viatores tribunicii*, was impelled to offer a banquet to the consul Metellus Scipio and the tribunes

⁵⁰ Sall. *Jug.* 4.4–8.

⁵¹ Sall. *Cat.* 4.1; cf. *Jug.* 4.3. Indeed, his retirement might belong a few months earlier, as a consequence of his conduct when governor in Africa (Cass. Dio 43.9.2).

⁵² For discussion and speculation, cf. W. Allen, 'Sallust's Political Career', *Studies in Philology* 51 (1954), 1–14, esp. 10–11.

⁵³ *CIL* 1², p. 64; *ILS* 6204.

⁵⁴ Sall. *Hist.* 3.3 [= 3 McG. = 3 R.]: *perdendae pecuniae genitus et vacuus a curis, nisi instantibus* ['a man born to squander money and devoid of worries, except for those immediately pressing upon him', trans. J. T. Ramsey].

⁵⁵ Cic. *Phil.* 3.16. Dio exploits this theme of Bambalio in speeches put into the mouths of Cicero and Fufius Calenus (45.47.4; 46.7.1, 28.1).

⁵⁶ Sall. *Cat.* 23.3; 17.4; 39.5. [6] ⁵⁷ Val. Max. 9.1.8.

of the plebs. The entertainment was devised in the setting of a *lupanar*, the prime exhibits being two ladies of birth, Mucia and Fulvia. Sallust, it will pertinently be recalled, was one of the tribunes.

[11] The same year brought the more illustrious Fulvia into sharp and melancholy prominence when her husband was killed by Milo. On the first day of the trial of Milo, Fulvia and her mother Sempronia gave their testimony and greatly moved the audience.⁵⁸ Sallust was concerned in these transactions. Along with other tribunes of the plebs he held violent speeches and stirred up feeling against Milo and Cicero.⁵⁹ To Sallust when he wrote his first monograph, Sempronia *Tuditani f.* was a portion of that exciting and turbulent past which he affected so bitterly to regret. He may also have known a more vivid lady, Sempronia, the wife of the consul D. Junius Brutus.

Of Fulvia, history has no good to tell. No indication hints that she either possessed or lacked the arts and graces of the accomplished Sempronia. But in every account stands out her pride, energy, and violence, worthy of the Fulvii.⁶⁰ Sempronia is introduced as a woman who had committed many deeds of virile audacity. Sempronia was perhaps her aunt, hence the reason for her prominence in the narrative of Sallust. But only one reason.

⁵⁸ Asc. 40.18–21.

⁵⁹ Asc. 37.18–21; 49.6–8; 49.24–50.2.

⁶⁰ It will be enough to cite, for the conventional view, Vell. 2.74.2: *nihil muliebre praeter corpus gerens* ['who had nothing womanly about her except her body']. In defence of Fulvia, F. Münzer, *RE* VII, 283–4; R. Syme, *RR* 208.

The End of the Fulvii

[1] The revolutionary movement that took its origin from the tribunate of Ti. Sempronius Gracchus had a permanent and disastrous effect upon the fortunes of certain noble families. The main line of the Sempronii Gracchi came to an end with the two illustrious and ill-fated tribunes;¹ other branches of the Sempronii had become extinct before now and could show no more consuls; and no bearer of the Sempronian name, whatever his family and politics, found admission to the Fasti of the Republic after C. Sempronius Tuditanus (*cos.* 129 BC).²

The dynastic house of the Fulvii, involved in the same catastrophe, fell from loftier eminence.³ M. Fulvius Flaccus (*cos.* 125 BC) and his two sons perished with the younger Gracchus; and no Fulvius ever afterwards was consul at Rome. After that disaster, the prospects of the surviving Fulvii were poor enough.⁴ M. Flaccus left a daughter, who married a certain L. Julius Caesar.⁵ The match turned out to be more remunerative than had been expected. The half-brother of L. Caesar was Q. Lutatius Catulus of the noble plebeian house now in decay;⁶ Catulus somehow brought back the consulate to the Lutatii after an absence of more than a century (102 BC); and L. Caesar himself, whose family, though patrician, was neither powerful nor distinguished, obtained the supreme magistracy in 90 BC. A previous political alliance between Fulvii and Julii might be surmised. The consulate of Sex. Caesar (157 BC), the grandfather

[1] ¹ There is no means of knowing how the Sempronii Gracchi of the Early Empire justified their *cognomen* or constructed their pedigree. Nor, for that matter, is it certain that L. Sempronius Atratinus (*cos. suff.* 34 BC) really deserved that *cognomen*, the choice of which asserted descent from patrician Sempronii who were consuls in the fifth century BC.

² On the politics of Tuditanus, see [RE II, 2, 2, 1441].

³ On the predominance of the Fulvii, see [essay no. 2 in this collection].

⁴ Apart from the daughter of M. Fulvius Flaccus, the only Fulvii known in the generation following are Q. Fulvius Q. f. M. [n.], attested by the inscription found near Caiatia (*ILS* 5742) and the *triumvir monetalis* Cn. Fulvius Flaccus (*BMCRR* 2.255–6, nos. 474–8 [= Sydenham, *RRC* 69, no. 539 = Crawford, *RRC* 1.300, no. 284]). The former is probably a son of Q. Nobilior (*cos.* 153 BC). On A. Fulvius, A. f. Tro, attested in 89 BC, see below, n. 14.

[1a] ⁵ Cic. *Cat.* 4.13.

⁶ Cic. *Dom.* 114; *De or.* 2.12, etc.

of L. Caesar, falls in the period when the Fulvii were certainly influential⁷—it was the first consulate of the Julii for more than a century; and in the next generation the consul's son Sextus was praetor in the year of C. Gracchus' first tribunate, but could get no further.

[2] Marius and his faction exerted their influence to recruit and promote *novi homines*, members of declining aristocratic houses, or victims of recent political vicissitudes;⁸ and the civil wars gave a man of parts the opportunity to make a skilful choice—or change—of side. None the less, the name of no Fulvius occurs in the record of wars and seditions from the sixth consulate of Marius to the dictatorship of Sulla.

The last generation of the Roman Republic, however, exhibits a small batch of Fulvii who do not appear to have lived discreetly or ended happily: unpopular with their contemporaries, they were effectively damned by the consonant verdict of subsequent history. One of them was grotesque and contemptible: the dull understanding of M. Fulvius Bambalio was aggravated by an impediment of speech which earned him that expressive *cognomen*.⁹ Bambalio took a wife from another family of the decaying aristocracy, Sempronius, the daughter of that Tuditanus, who was the son of the consul of 129 BC. Tuditanus was a peculiar character: it is alleged that he used to mount the Rostra in the garb of a tragic actor, and distribute largesse to the people.¹⁰ Of such unprepossessing parent was born the famous Fulvia, the wife of Marcus Antonius the Triumvir.

It is not altogether surprising that the conspiracy of Catilina harboured some Fulvii in its mixed and murky company. A woman called Fulvia, *mulier nobilis*, mistress of the disreputable Curius, laid information with the consul Cicero;¹¹ and M. Fulvius Nobilior, of equestrian rank, but indicating noble descent by his illustrious nomenclature, turns up in the list of the

⁷ M. Fulvius Nobilior was consul in 159 BC, an otherwise unknown M. Aemilius Lepidus in 158 BC. If the Popillii were their allies at this time, the combination must have been powerful, for M. Popillius Laenas got the censorship in 159 BC and his brother Gaius a second consulate the next year.

⁸ See [RR 19, 94].

⁹ Cic. *Phil.* 3.16: *Bambalio quidam pater, homo nullo numero. nihil illo contemptius, qui propter haesitantiam linguae stuporemque cordis cognomen ex contumelia traxerit* ['the father, a fellow of the name of Bambalio, was a man of no account at all. Nothing was more contemptible than him, a man who got his *cognomen* as a sort of insult, derived from a speech impediment and the weakness of his intellect'].

Cf. Cic. *Phil.* 2.90; Val. Max. 7.8.1; Cass. Dio 45.47.4, 46.7.1, 46.28.1.

¹⁰ Cic. *Phil.* 3.16: *at avus nobilis: Tuditanus nempe ille, qui cum palla et cothurnis nummos populo de rostris spargere solebat* ['But her grandfather was a nobleman: the famous Tuditanus, of course, who used to scatter coins among the people from the Rostra, dressed in an actor's robe and buskins']. Cf. Val. Max. 7.8.1; Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 3.23. Cic. *Acad.* 2.89 describes him as a connection of Q. Lutatius Catulus (*cos.* 78 BC). Tuditanus was a first cousin of Q. Hortensius (*cos.* 69 BC), whose sister Catulus married. On those relationships, see further F. Münzer, 'Hortensius und Cicero bei historischen Studien', *Hermes* 39 (1914), 196–213, at 209 [= KS 261–78, at 274].

[2] ¹¹ Sall. *Cat.* 23.3; cf. Val. Max. 9.1.8.

conspirators.¹² Further, the son of a senator called Fulvius would have joined Catilina, only his father caught him [3] and had him put to death.¹³ It is not clear, however, that he was a descendant of the genuine and noble Fulvii: he was perhaps the son of a certain A. Fulvius.¹⁴ Some would identify the young man with the knight M. Fulvius Nobilior—wrongly, for that person is mentioned again in 54 BC.¹⁵

To complete the list of decayed Fulvii may be added Q. (? Fulvius) Flaccus, known only as an associate of the turbulent Milo.¹⁶ Other Fulvii of this period do not appear to be of noble birth, namely P. Fulvius Neratus, one of the prosecutors of Milo,¹⁷ and the senator Fulvius Setinus (if the name is correct) who in 46 BC desired to descend into the arena and fight as a gladiator.¹⁸ Nor is it likely to be profitable to speculate about the identity of the Fulvius proscribed by the Triumvirs—and betrayed by his former mistress, a jealous woman.¹⁹

An odd Fulvius remains to be accounted for, only a name, but transmitted in significant, not to say questionable, company. The inscription from Gythium mentions, with the title *legatus*, three senators, probably, but not certainly legates of M. Antonius (Creticus) during his command in eastern waters against the pirates (74–71 BC): they are P. Autronius, C. Julius, and Fulvius.²⁰ The first of these is at once identified—P. Autronius Paetus (quaestor in 75 BC, and designated consul for 65 BC), the notorious Catilinarian. As for C. Julius, some have supposed that this is no other than C. Julius Caesar:²¹ which might be so. The record of Caesar's early career is partial and fragmentary, for attention was fixed and held by episodes of dramatic and defamatory value.²² But there is another candidate, namely C. Julius whom Catilina despatched to Apulia to organise a rising in that region.²³ This person is not named [4] in the list of senators associated with Catilina—perhaps he had lost his rank, along with no fewer than sixty-three others, when the high assembly was drastically purged in 70 BC.²⁴

¹² Sall. *BC* 17.4.

¹³ *Ibid.* 39.5.

¹⁴ A certain A. Fulvius A. f. Tro. was present at Asculum in the *consilium* of Cn. Pompeius in 89 BC. So too was Catiline, there designated as L. Sergius L. f. Tro. Dio (37.36.4) and Valerius Maximus (5.8.3) both describe the Fulvius whom his father put to death as a A. Fulvius, a man of senatorial rank: the divergence from Sallust is not serious. Both may derive from Livy.

¹⁵ Cic. *Att.* 4.18.3.

¹⁶ Cic. *Att.* 14.3.3–4.

¹⁷ Asc. [38.23–39.1, 54.14–16]. Cicero had described him as *lectissimus homo* (Flacc. 46), whatever that may mean.

¹⁸ Cass. Dio 43.23.5. Suetonius calls him Furius Leptinus (*DJ* 39.2).

¹⁹ App. *BC* 4.24. Also Fulvius Postumus (Caes. *BC* 3.62.4) and Fulvius, his father (Macrob. *Sat.* 2.2.9) can be omitted.

²⁰ *SIG*³ 748, l. 22–3: Γάϊόν τε Ίού[λι]ον πρεσβευτὰν καὶ Πόπλιον Αὐτρώνιον πρεσβευτὰν καὶ Φούλβ[ι]ον πρεσβευτὰν [‘the legate Gaius Julius and the legate Publius Autronius and the legate Fulvius’].

²¹ For example, Dittenberger *ad loc.*

²² [See e.g. Suet. *DJ* 1–2, 49, 74; Plut. *Caes.* 1–2.]

²³ Sall. *Cat.* 27.1.

²⁴ Livy *Per.* 98.

The third legate, Fulvius, may well stand in some relation to the two Catilinarian Fulvii. Whatever his precise identity, that hypothesis would not exclude a connection with M. Antonius Creticus, who, having married Julia, the daughter of the consul of 90 BC, had a Fulvia as his mother-in-law.²⁵ It is appropriate that a Fulvius should be among his legates—and disquieting that, of the others, Autronius was indubitably a Catilinarian, and so perhaps was that obscure character C. Julius. These personal connections, by chance preserved, are of some interest in view of subsequent events. M. Antonius Creticus was an amiable but careless fellow.²⁶ His disreputable brother C. Antonius, who had been thrown out of the Senate in 70 BC, stood for the consulate in 64 BC. According to the historian Sallust, Catilina expected that Antonius would prove a most acceptable colleague, being bound to his cause by various ties.²⁷ Cicero was certainly distrustful of Antonius. Other accounts go further and assert that he was actually an associate of Catilina.²⁸ Another connection of the Antonii was the patrician P. Lentulus Sura, like C. Antonius a victim of the purge of 70 BC. Next to Catilina, he was the most important member of the conspiracy. Now Sura, it will be recalled, after the death of Creticus, had married his widow Julia, daughter of Fulvia and granddaughter of M. Fulvius Flaccus.²⁹

Be that as it may, the attested link between the Antonii and the Fulvii was subsequently drawn tighter when the son of [5] Creticus took to wife Fulvia, the daughter of Bambalio and Sempronia.³⁰ Fulvia showed a nice discernment in the choice of husbands—she had previously been married to Clodius and Curio. Bambalio is sometimes reckoned as the last of the noble Fulvii. A woman should hold that title, precisely as history knows Servilia as the last of the Servilii Caepiones. Like Servilia, Fulvia was aroused to ambition and excited to action by the decline of her illustrious house. The virile and imperious wife of the Triumvir Antonius was not unworthy of her ancestors, or the rôle she chose to play in politics. She opens the line of the great imperial ladies, for she is the first to have her effigy on the coins of her consort.³¹

History saddles Fulvia with the guilt of fomenting war against Octavianus, the War of Perugia, for trivial motives. It may be that her importance has been exaggerated, just as her conduct has been distorted. Hostile propaganda is merciless towards Fulvia where it cannot be proved mendacious. Fulvia's death, following close upon these transactions, was opportune to her husband as well as to her enemies; and nobody afterwards had any cause to redeem her memory from the vilest defamation. There were no more Fulvii.

²⁵ *RE* I, 2, 2595, no. 29. ²⁶ *Sall. Hist.* [3.3 M. = 3 McG. = 3 R.].

²⁷ *Sall. Cat.* 2.3; cf. 26.1.

²⁸ For example, *Cass. Dio* 37.30.3, 39.3—perhaps deriving from Livy.

²⁹ On Fulvia, see further [cross-reference missing].

³⁰ Cf. U. Kahrstedt, 'Frauen auf antiken Münzen', *Klio* 10 (1910), 291–2.

³¹ Cf. F. Münzer, *RE* VII, 283–4, no. 113; Syme, *RR* [208].

Caesar as *Pontifex Maximus*

[1] The new tribunes taking office in December, 64 BC, were out for trouble. They quickly promoted a number of bills designed to vex the government and provoke opposition from the leaders—or defenders—of the oligarchy, thus showing them up as enemies of the People and of Pompeius, the People's general, as bigoted revolutionaries.¹ Some of these legislative proposals meant what they said—and some did not. Nor were all of them intended to succeed. The agrarian bill of Servilius Rullus was perhaps an elaborate trap for the consul Cicero: if so, he fell in. The *consul popularis*,² as he designated himself, at once intervened and secured the defeat of a popular measure.

There was nothing ambiguous about two proposals of T. Labienus, a man from Picenum and presumably a close adherent of Pompeius Magnus.³ The first of them conferred extravagant honours upon Pompeius.⁴ The second was a direct attack upon the legislation of Sulla. From some time in the third century BC the *pontifex maximus* had been chosen—or rather perhaps nominated—by an electoral body comprising seventeen of the thirty-five tribes;⁵ in 104 BC the tribune Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, resentful against the dominant faction of the aristocracy, extended the procedure to the four principal priestly colleges.⁶ Sulla went back to co-optation, revoking the *lex Domitia*. It is sometimes assumed that he also abolished popular election of the *pontifex maximus*. It may be so, but it is not certain. Now, however, the bill of Labienus overthrew the sacerdotal ordinances of Sulla. The *pontifex maximus*, Metellus Pius, having recently died, Julius Caesar put forward his

[1] ¹ [Cass. Dio 37.25.3–4.] ² Cic. *leg. agr.* 2.6.

³ Compare the arguments adduced in 'The Allegiance of Labienus', *JRS* 28 (1938), 113–25 [= *RP* 1.62–75].

⁴ Vell. 2.40.4; cf. Cass. Dio 37.21.4, who omits the names of the tribunes responsible for the bill (Labienus and T. Ampius Balbus) attributing its success to Caesar's efforts.

⁵ The first attested election in this summer is that of P. Licinius Crassus in 212 BC, Livy 25.5.2–4. But it might have been already employed for the plebeians Ti. Coruncanius (252 BC) or L. Metellus (248 BC), cf. Münzer, *RA* [185–6]. The reason for the peculiar procedure is given by Cic. *leg. agr.* 2.18: *quod per populum creari fas non erat propter religionem sacrorum*.

⁶ Suet. *Nero* 2.1; Cic. *leg. agr.* 2.18; cf. Cass. Dio 37.37.1 and below, n. 35 and n. 36.

candidature. An exciting political contest was in prospect. Bribery and popularity won a signal victory over two of the *principes civitatis*. They were the senior consulars P. Servilius Isauricus (*cos.* 79 BC) and Q. Lutatius Catulus (*cos.* 78 BC)—for nobody counted an Etruscan relic called Perperna.⁷

Caesar was only aedilician in rank. Such an election was startling, but not, as some have supposed,⁸ unprecedented. In 212 BC, the aedile P. Licinius Crassus was successful against two senior statesmen, T. Manlius Torquatus and [2] Q. Fulvius Flaccus, each supported by the accumulated prestige of a second consulate and a censorship—Flaccus, indeed, was consul for the third time in that very year 212 BC.⁹ The success of Crassus will in large measure be attributed to the splendour of the show he gave as aedile.¹⁰ Caesar's costly aedileship may here be recalled.¹¹ But the resentful Optimates knew a nearer and more painful precedent. In 103 BC Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, an ex-tribune, was elected *pontifex maximus* by grateful voters not many months after the passing of his own *lex Domitia*.¹² Catulus was related to the Domitii.¹³ Young Ahenobarbus did not forget his own claim to his father's distinction.¹⁴ Fifteen years later in the camp of Pompeius at Pharsalus he anticipated the spoils of victory and wrangled for the succession, contending with Lentulus Spinther and Metellus Scipio.¹⁵

Caesar's triumph was dramatic—and embellished by the proud words of farewell to his mother on the morning of the polls.¹⁶ All things, however, are not clear about the election. Above all, what precisely was the value of the office; in what ways did the new *pontifex* exploit its advantage?

The date of the election is uncertain. Ovid gives 6 March, but that is for Augustus in 12 BC, not Caesar:

Caesaris innumeris, quos maluit ille mereri,
accessit titulis pontificalis honor.
ignibus aeternis aeterni numina praesunt
Caesaris: imperii pignora iuncta vides.¹⁷

⁷ M. Perperna, consul 92 BC, censor 86 BC, did not die until 49 BC (Plin. *Nat.* 7.156; Cass. Dio 41.14.5).

⁸ For example, M. Gelzer, *Caesar. Der Politiker und Staatsmann* (Munich 1941²) 57. Carcopino, mentioning the case of P. Crassus (212 BC), states that there had been no precedent since that occasion (*Points de vue sur l'impérialisme romain* [Paris 1934], 'La royauté de César', 111). He entirely ignores Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus.

⁹ Livy 25.2.2–4, as interpreted by Münzer, *RA* 185–91.

¹⁰ Plin. *Nat.* 21.6: *Crassus Dives primus argento auroque folia imitatus ludis suis coronas dedit.*

¹¹ Suet. *DJ* 10. ¹² Livy *Per.* 12.

¹³ Cf. Münzer, *RE* XIII, 2073–4 and [*RA* 286–7].

¹⁴ Cf. Syme, *RR* 24.

¹⁵ *Caes. BC* 3.83.1. ¹⁶ Plut. *Caes.* 7.

¹⁷ Ov. *Fasti* 3.419–22 ['To Caesar's countless titles has been added the one he preferred to be worthy of, the honour of *pontifex*. Over the eternal fires eternal Caesar's divine powers preside. You see the pledges of empire joined', trans. A. and P. Wiseman].

Lepidus, the *pontifex maximus*, terminated his long and enforced seclusion at Circeii by dying towards the end of 13 BC.¹⁸ Augustus delayed for some months before assuming the vacant office. Why? It has been suggested that he waited and chose March 6 precisely because that day marked the anniversary of Caesar's election.¹⁹ Nothing could be less likely. Augustus' claim has nothing to do with the fact that he was Caesar's heir, *Divi filius*. On the contrary, he wished his candidature to be very different both from that of Caesar and that of Lepidus. Lepidus is mentioned with disapproval in the *Res Gestae*;²⁰ about Caesar, naturally, it was expedient, here as elsewhere, to say nothing at all.²¹

[3] Ovid's description of Augustus is to the point—*maluit ille mereri* ['he preferred to deserve']. The *princeps* who had restored and renewed the religion of the Roman State deserved the dignity of *pontifex maximus*. He could afford to wait. Eagerness to despoil Lepidus was both indecent and unprofitable. There was another reason. When the Roman People chose Augustus as *pontifex maximus*, there streamed to Rome such a concourse as had never been known before.²² To organise a spontaneous manifestation of the loyal sentiments of *tota Italia* it was desirable to reckon with the season of the year. For voters from the Abruzzi, spring was better than midwinter.

The exact date, therefore, is not known. Yet it should be possible to establish the chronology of political events in the year 63 BC. Suetonius places the election after Labienus' prosecution of Rabirius;²³ Cassius Dio, passing at once from the affair of Rabirius to the Catilinarian conspiracy, only mentions the election at the end, and out of chronology.²⁴ Dio states that Caesar was confident of popular support because he had helped Labienus at the trial of Rabirius—and because he had not voted for the execution of Lentulus, the accomplice of Catilina. Dio is patently in error about the relation in time between Caesar's election and the suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy. It would therefore be unsound to reject Dio on Lentulus but accept him on Rabirius, even if he happens to be right on the latter count. Fortunately, it does not matter. The testimony of Suetonius, a careful student, is good enough: his account of the relative chronology of Caesar's early career can nowhere be impugned.

None the less, two recent, elaborate, and authoritative histories of the period coolly desert Suetonius, and, without a word of explanation, assume that Caesar's election as *pontifex maximus* came before, not after, the prosecution

[2] ¹⁸ Cass. Dio 54.27.2.

¹⁹ J. Carcopino, *Histoire romaine* (Paris 1929) 626 n. 163: 'je maintendrais volontiers pour date de l'élection le 6 mars'.

²⁰ RG 10.2: *eo mor[t]uo q[ui] civilis m[otus] occasione occupaverat* ['on the death of the man who had taken the opportunity of civil unrest to appropriate it'].

²¹ On the Augustan attitude towards Julius Caesar, cf. RR 317–18.

²² RG 10.

²³ Suet. DJ 12.

²⁴ Cass. Dio 37.37.1–2.

of Rabirius.²⁵ On the contrary, even if Suetonius did not provide the order of events, it may be deduced from the situation.

It will not be necessary here to discuss the notoriously tangled problems of legal procedure raised by the prosecution of Rabirius;²⁶ sufficient to say that Labienus took the lead in indicting the elderly Rabirius for killing a Roman citizen, to wit Saturninus, in the disturbances of 100 BC. Labienus had [4] a just cause and family feud—his uncle had perished on that occasion. Cicero, it is true, does not mention Caesar's name in the speech defending Rabirius; and there is always the possibility that the rôle of Caesar has been exaggerated.²⁷ The argument from silence, however, is not conclusive. The true begetters, or eventual beneficiaries, of certain political proposals in this year were not always before the public eye. Cicero might say what he liked about Labienus; but he would think twice before incurring a feud with an influential young *nobilis*. Such men were dangerous.

In the first instance an archaic form of procedure, going back to the time of the Kings of Rome, was resurrected, that of *perduellio*. The operation of the lot produced as *duoviri perduellionis* Caesar and his distant kinsman, L. Julius Caesar, consul in the previous year.²⁸ They duly condemned Rabirius to be crucified and hung from a barren tree—*arbori infelici suspendito*, so the formula ran.²⁹ The sentence was quashed by Cicero, in virtue of consular authority. Further proceedings are obscure, but the end was a comedy. When the case came up before the Comitia, the presiding magistrate, the praetor Metellus Celer, acting no doubt in collusion with the prosecutors, prevented the centuries from voting. He hit upon a device in perfect consonance with the tone of the whole affair—he ordered the red flag on the Janiculum to be lowered, a signal which in old days indicated the approach of an Etruscan army.³⁰ Either the conviction or the absolution of Rabirius might have proved embarrassing. It had clearly not been intended that Rabirius, an unsavoury but harmless octogenarian, should be put to death. Cicero in his speech before the *Comitia centuriata* described it as no less than an attack on the palladium of the Constitution, the *Senatus consultum de re publica defendenda*—and on the memory and conduct of C. Marius, the popular consul of the year 100 BC.³¹ Perhaps he was taking it too seriously: the prosecution was intended, not so much to warn the government against an abuse of the *Senatus consultum*, as to stir up prejudice and exploit popular resentment against the methods of the oligarchy. Caesar in the previous year had already attacked the Sullan proscriptions, which were, in fact, covered by an act of indemnity. As president of

²⁵ CAH IX (1932) 487; Carcopino, *Histoire romaine*, 626–8.

²⁶ [Cf. E. G. Hardy, 'Political and Legal Aspects of the Trial of Rabirius', in *Some Problems in Roman History* (Oxford 1924) 99–125.]

²⁷ Cf. H. Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt in die Geschichte* (Munich 1938) 119.

²⁸ Cass. Dio 37.27.2.

²⁹ Cic. *Rab. perd.* 13.

³⁰ Cass. Dio 37.23.3.

³¹ Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 2–3, 27–9.

the *quaestio de sicariis* he made a deter[5]mined attempt to have two of Sulla's agents, Bellienus and Luscius, condemned, and he succeeded.³² His action on this occasion has been stigmatised as a legal mistake, a political error, and a tactical blunder.³³ Not satisfied with this, Caesar proceeds to engineer the prosecution of Rabirius, which, on the face of things, is a fiasco. A concatenation of blunders. The same young man finds the skill and the influence to get himself elected *pontifex maximus*, against Catulus and Isauricus. It is curious.

The history of Roman politics furnishes parallel and precedent to a failed prosecution begetting victory. Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus bore a grudge against the sacerdotal authorities—they had not co-opted him as *pontifex* in place of his deceased parent.³⁴ Hence the *Lex Domitia*, transferring election to the people. Now Domitius prosecuted the venerable Scaurus, the *princeps senatus*, alleging that he had been responsible for neglecting the cult of the Penates at Lanuvium.³⁵ Scaurus was triumphantly acquitted.³⁶ Nevertheless, it is not Scaurus or any other consular that gets elected *pontifex maximus*, but Ahenobarbus.³⁷ Was the attack on Scaurus a piece of electioneering, designed to show the voters that Ahenobarbus was better qualified in the department of sacred law than were some of his seniors?

The prosecution of Rabirius, by insisting on an archaic ritual which, through its very barbarity and absurdity, was so vulnerable to attack, should at once have forfeited all chance of succeeding. Did that matter to Caesar? Perhaps the choice of *perduellio* as procedure was the important thing, for it enabled him to advertise his skill as an expert in ritual. That is to say, a rehearsal for his candidature to the office of supreme pontiff.

One argument will be added in support of the order of events given by Suetonius. It would surely be an anomaly, at the very least, for the head of the State religion to get himself appointed *duovir perduellionis*, unfair to the defendant—and most undignified. Caesar was later to show himself very careful about the dignity of his sacerdotal office.³⁸

Caesar was, in fact, a highly suitable candidate; and his success regained for the patriciate an office that had been monopolised for seventy years by the plebeian nobility. The Julii, a patrician family from Alba Longa, possessed a

³² Asc. 91.1–3; Suet. *DJ* 11.2.

³³ M. Cary, 'Rome in the Absence of Pompey', *CAH IX* (Cambridge 1932) 475–505, at 489.

³⁴ Suet. *Nero* 2.1: *pontificibus offensior, quod alium quam se in patris sui locum cooptassent* ['he was furious with the pontiffs, because they had co-opted someone other than himself into the place of his father']. This may, or may not, be an alternative explanation of the reason for his attack on Scaurus, see n. 36. The date of his tribunate is given as 103 BC by Velleius (2.17.3), as 104 BC by Asconius (p. 71 = 79–80 Clark), who is to be preferred.

³⁵ Asconius (p. 19–20 = 27 Clark), who says that Ahenobarbus was resentful because Scaurus had not co-opted him into his college of augurs. Cf. the previous note.

³⁶ *CAH IX*, 160.

³⁷ *Livy Per.* 67.

³⁸ Cf. [below, p. 93–4].

gentile cult of their own, the worship of the mysterious [6] deity Vediovis.³⁹ Religious antiquities were a very proper study for a patrician—and the Julii did their duty. L. Caesar (*cos.* 64 BC) wrote books on the subject;⁴⁰ and Caesar's first cousin, Sex. Caesar, was *flamen Quirinalis*.⁴¹ Caesar had already been a member of the college of *pontifices* for ten years;⁴² but his interest in religion and ritual went back to his early youth. He had been nominated *flamen Dialis* under the domination of the party of Marius and Cinna, but not, it appears, consecrated.⁴³ Sulla deprived him of the priesthood—surely no great penalty, for the tabus which enfenced it excluded a man from an active political career, and from many other things as well. There is no evidence that Caesar was eager to become *flamen Dialis*, or that he regretted his loss—the family perhaps hoped to keep him out of danger in a murderous period. Nevertheless, the young man had leisure to get up the subject pretty thoroughly—it was in no way distasteful to one who was so ferocious a rigorist in grammar and orthography, so pedantic about his personal appearance.

Caesar's precise knowledge of archaic ritual, indicated by the prosecution of Rabirius, was advertised by a strange incident that occurred in 46 BC. On the occasion of a mutiny, he ordered two of the ringleaders to be seized and put to death in ritual fashion by the *pontifices* and the *flamen Martialis*. Their heads were hung up outside the Regia.⁴⁴

This being so, to attain the dignity of *pontifex maximus*, was for Caesar a peculiar satisfaction as well as a political triumph. He remained in enjoyment of it for nearly twenty years. What did he do with it?

It has been claimed by an eloquent advocate that Caesar modified the character of that office, that he charged it with dynamism, that he used it as a spiritual lever to revolutionise the Roman State, that it was the invincible

³⁹ ILS 2988 (Bovillae).

[3] ⁴⁰ Macrob. *Sat.* 1.16.29; *Grammatici Latini*, ed. Keil, 2.270.5; 380.3. Possibly the same as the Caesar quoted in Servius *Aen.* 1.28–9. for a detail about Julius, the eponym of the family. L. Caesar was chosen augur at an early age, in 80 BC, cf. F. Münzer, 'Zu den Fasti augurum', *Hermes* 52 (1917), 152–5 [= KS, 152–5].

⁴¹ Cic. *Har. resp.* 19.

⁴² Vell. 2.43.1.

⁴³ Suet. *DJ* 1 etc. There is no evidence that he actually held this priesthood, as has sometimes been assumed. It appears that *nominatio* by the *pontifex maximus* had occurred—but not *inauguratio*. Cf. [RE X, 1, no. 131, col. 187].

⁴⁴ Cass. Dio 43.24.4: ἄλλοι δὲ δύο ἄνδρες ἐν τρόπῳ τινὶ ἱεροουργίας ἐσφάγησαν. Καὶ τὸ μὲν αἴτιον οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν οὔτε γὰρ ἡ Σίβυλλα ἔχρησεν, οὔτ' ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτο λόγιον ἐγένετο, ἐν δ' οὖν τῷ Ἀρείῳ πεδίῳ πρὸς τε τῶν ποντιφικῶν καὶ πρὸς τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ Ἀρεως ἐτύθησαν ['two other men were killed in a sort of ritual. I am unable to state the cause, inasmuch as the Sibyl made no utterance and there was no other similar oracle; at any rate, they were sacrificed in the Campus Martius by the pontiffs and the priest of Mars'].

Compare the observations of W. Warde-Fowler, 'An unnoticed Trait in the Character of Julius Caesar', *CR* 30 (1916), 68–71. The ritual adapted was clearly that of the October Horse, cf. G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Munich 1912²) 145–6.

sanctuary where he would establish his sovereignty by right divine, and what not.⁴⁵ It remains to discover the facts.

In ancient days the *pontifex maximus*, being president of a college which, besides the *pontifices*, included the *rex sacrorum*, the *flamines*, and the Vestal Virgins, all of them except the *pontifices* nominated by himself, exercised formidable powers of a political character.⁴⁶ By seizing—the word is *capere*—for the service of Vesta the daughters of his enemies he could [7] preclude their employment for dynastic marriages. Likewise he might lay hands on the son of a patrician house, compelling him to be inaugurated as *rex* or as one of the major *flamines*, which priesthoods commonly debarred a man from public life. The great families of the plebeian nobility thus had a very valuable weapon against the patricians. For example, C. Valerius Flaccus was taken against his will in 208 BC;⁴⁷ after tremendous exertions he at last won his way to the praetorship twenty-five years later.⁴⁸

Quasi-magisterial in status himself, the supreme pontiff jealously asserted his prerogative to prevent a *flamen* from holding a magistracy or governing a province.⁴⁹ The last case of this kind was in 131 BC, when P. Licinius Crassus Mucianus blocked from the command in Asia his colleague in the consulate, L. Valerius Flaccus, and took it for himself.⁵⁰ Further, his competence extended beyond his own college—he could coerce or fine other priests as well;⁵¹ and he might even impose a pecuniary penalty on a magistrate, as did the great Lepidus in 159 BC, as a result of a dispute with a praetor, this demonstrating the superior virtue of sacerdotal over civil right.⁵²

Most of these privileges had lapsed by the last age of the Republic—it was not so much the decline of faith as the development of jurisprudence. The office could no longer be used for political initiative or for obstruction—still less as basis for establishing monarchy by right divine. The two things belong to different spheres of thought and action. Despite this evident truth, it has been alleged that Caesar employed the supreme priesthood in that fashion.⁵³

The case of Sulla provides an analogy, a contrast and a refutation. Strange claims are also made for him. It is asserted that Sulla, not Caesar or Augustus, should be regarded as the true founder of the monarchy—and of the worship

⁴⁵ This has been maintained by Carcopino, *Points de vue sur l'impérialisme romain*, 114: 'il en avait modifié la nature et accumulé le dynamisme. Il s'en était saisi comme du levier spirituel à soulever l'état. Il y insérait le Droit inébranlable et sacré qui vivifierait la force de ses légions'. Cf. *Histoire romaine* (Paris 1936) 627–8, especially his phrase 'plus tard il s'en servirait pour fonder ses prétentions royales'.

⁴⁶ Cf. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus*, 501–23.

⁴⁷ Livy 27.8.4. For this interpretation, cf. Münzer, *RA* 189.

⁴⁸ For the difficulties besetting his official career cf. Livy 31.50.6–10; 32.7.14; 39.39.1–15.

[4] ⁴⁹ For example, Livy *Per.* 19 (242 BC); Livy 37.51.1–2; 40.42.8–13.

⁵⁰ Cic. *Phil.* 11.18.

⁵¹ Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus*, 511.

⁵² Livy *Per.* 47: *sacrorumque quam magistratum ius potentius fuit*.

⁵³ See Carcopino's statement quoted above, n. 45.

of the monarch—at Rome.⁵⁴ Among the pieces of evidence produced is Sulla's insistence on the fact that he was augur—the *lituus* of this augur appears on coins minted by him in Greece in 86 BC;⁵⁵ and when announcing to the Roman government his demands, he specified the restitution of the priesthood.⁵⁶ It is to be regretted that the author of this precious theory has not explained why it is that Sulla, aiming at personal rule on the basis of divine honours, did not assume the dignity of *pontifex maximus*, by any reckoning a more potent weapon of spiritual dynamism than the augurship. It was his for the taking—[8] the Marian party had just murdered Q. Mucius Scaevola (82 BC). But Sulla, it must appear, was quite obtuse. He let Metellus Pius become official head of the religion of the Roman State. How right Caesar was in his verdict! The Dictator did not know even the rudiments—*Sullam nescisse litteras* ['Sulla did not know his ABC']. It is indeed asserted that Pius alone of all the Metelli understood and embodied the ideals of Sulla. How and why?—because incense was burned in his honour in Spain.⁵⁷ That fatuous fumigation attests the adulation of provincials, the vanity of a proconsul: it has nothing to do with Pius' being *pontifex maximus*. And, in nearly twenty years was not very bright either. Centuries later an antiquarian writer records that Metellus Pius, the *pontifex maximus*, presided at a sumptuous banquet when L. Lentulus Niger was consecrated as *flamen Martialis*.⁵⁸ Otherwise nothing, except that Pius, by dying opportunely, left the place open for Caesar.

Nor, in fact, does Caesar's possession of the dignity of *pontifex maximus* invite comment from contemporary writers. He did nothing to bring the office into prominence, despite occasions when it might have appeared useful, or even inevitable. The festival of the *Bona Dea* was celebrated in Caesar's house in 62 BC, but only because he was then a magistrate with *imperium*,⁵⁹ and when, as a result of the scandal of Clodius' adventure, a divorce followed, the reason given for the repudiation of Pompeia was that Caesar's wife must be

⁵⁴ Carcopino, *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée* (Paris 1931) 86: 'en effet, le véritable fondateur du culte impérial, ce n'a été, ni Auguste qui l'a réglementé, ni César qui, pourtant, fut adoré comme un dieu de son vivant en Italie comme en Orient, mais bien Sylla qui, le premier dans l'histoire romaine, a érigé son pouvoir au-dessus des contingences humaines sur le plan des choses éternelles'.

⁵⁵ *BMCRR* 2.459–60, nos. 1–4 = Sydenham, *RRC* 124, no. 760–1 [= Crawford, *RRC* 1.373–4, no. 359].

⁵⁶ App. *BC* 1.79.

⁵⁷ Sall. *Hist.* 2.59 M. [= 59 McG. = 48 R.]; Plut. *Pomp.* 18, *Sert.* 22; Val. Max. 9.1.5. Cf. Carcopino, *Sylla*, 187 n. 1: 'de tous les Metelli il était sans doute alors le seul à comprendre et partager l'idéal syllanien'.

⁵⁸ Macrobian *Sat.* 3.13.11. A fragment of Festus (p. 343 M. [= 462/464 Lindsay]) as restored by Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II, 32, records a dispute between a Metellus, *pontifex maximus*, and an augur called Claudius. It is not certain that this was Metellus Pius—it might have been L. Metellus (p. m. 243–221 BC) or L. Metellus Delmaticus (p. m. 115–103 BC). The passage is not mentioned in *RE*, s.v. Caecilius Metellus.

⁵⁹ Cic. *Har. resp.* 37 etc.

above reproach—not a word about the supreme pontiff's consort. One recalls Caesar's constant and pedantic insistence on his own personal *dignitas*.⁶⁰

The contests and tumults of Roman politics during the years when Caesar was praetor and consul reveal no trace of any attempts to emphasise the priest at the expense of the magistrate, to revive archaic forms and fantastic procedures. When he threw a quaestor into prison, it was expressly to vindicate the superior authority of the praetor;⁶¹ and Caesar as consul allowed his colleague Bibulus to watch the heavens for signs. If Bibulus and his allies hoped to provoke the *pontifex maximus* to an assertion of religious prerogative or to a clash of authority, they were mistaken. Caesar did nothing. The only public act of the supreme pontiff was his presiding at the Comitia Curiata when it became desirable to accelerate the transfer of Clodius from the patriciate to the plebs.⁶² It is clear that Caesar was scrupulous not to compromise or discredit the dignity of his high sacerdotal office by utilising it for political ends.

[9] Then, after Caesar's consulate, came the long years of absence in Gaul. The college of pontiffs got on quite well without him; and the dynamism of the *pontifex maximus* was available to inspire the legions—if they cared for such things.⁶³

Nor does Caesar the Dictator appear to exploit in politics his religious prerogative to buttress up his power. He reformed the Roman calendar, an eminently proper activity for the head of the official cult: it would have [been] carried out by [*text missing*]. Caesar the Dictator, however, was *pontifex maximus*—he had a passion for order and tidiness. Like Sulla, Caesar increased the membership of the sacred colleges.⁶⁴ Otherwise next to nothing is known about the *lex Julia de sacerdotiis*.⁶⁵ Not but what, had he lived, Caesar would not have taken proper steps to revive and reorganise the official cult, as a necessary part of the regeneration of the Roman State; and it was fitting that the author of reform should in fact be the head of the state religion.

The nature and value of the office of *pontifex maximus* now becomes clear. It was a sign of political success, it conferred great prestige—and it lapsed only with death. The *pontifex maximus* had the right to a good house on the Via Sacra—to which domicile Caesar gladly moved from the modest family dwelling in the Subura.⁶⁶ He enjoyed perquisites, including the right to preside

⁶⁰ Cf. RR 48.

⁶¹ Suet. DJ 17.2: *quod compellari apud se maiorem potestatem passus esset* ['because he had allowed a magistrate with powers superior to his own to be summoned to court'].

[6] ⁶² Cic. Att. 2.12.1; 8.3.3. Cf. S. Weinstock, 'Clodius and the *Lex Aelia Fufia*', JRS 27 (1937), 215–22.

⁶³ Compare the phrase of Carcopino quoted above, n. 45.

⁶⁴ Cass. Dio 42.51.4.

⁶⁵ Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus*, 73.

⁶⁶ Suet. DJ 46.1: *habitavit primo in Subura modicis aedibus, post autem pontificatum maximum in Sacra uia domo publica* ['first he lived in the Subura in a modest house; however, after he became *pontifex maximus*, he lived in the official residence on the Via Sacra']. This change of domicile, mentioned naturally, and in its proper context, by Suetonius, could not fail to cause

at lavish dinner parties. The most valuable facility, however, was political patronage. Though the People now elected the major priests, it was from a list filled by nomination, upon which the supreme pontiff presumably exercised due influence. It was through Caesar's help that Lentulus Spinther became *pontifex*.⁶⁷ Caesar was proud of his dignity, and did nothing to compromise it. In all the attacks made upon his public conduct and private life, either before or after his death, his tenure of the office is spared. Caesar placed the sacred emblem on his coinage, naturally enough:⁶⁸ so had Sulla the augur.⁶⁹ But it is difficult to believe the story of the Senate's decree, with Caesar's approval, that the office of *pontifex maximus* should become hereditary in the *gens Julia*.⁷⁰

This is no place to expatiate upon Caesar's views about religion in general, his policy towards the Roman cult, or his aspirations to monarchy. But it is desirable to dispel misconceptions and avoid obnubilation of thought. Which need not take long. First, to carry out a reform in the religion of Rome, it is not necessary to be *pontifex maximus*. Augustus showed this. Secondly, the [10] acceptance of divine honours and the establishment of monarchy are not sensibly helped (or hindered) by the traditional religion of the Roman State. Augustus again. Caesar did not, after all, modify the nature of the office; and Lepidus inherited it from Caesar, unchanged, as Metellus Pius had left it. To be *pontifex maximus* is, in itself, irrelevant to monarchy or theocracy. 'Accumulated dynamism' and 'spiritual lever' are specious phrases, masking error and confusion.⁷¹

confusion. Carcopino states 'par ce déménagement insolite il se rapprochait, non seulement de la demeure, mais de la condition des rois' (*Histoire romaine*, 627). It need not be added that this *domus publica* was not the same as the Regia—Servius (on *Aen.* 8.363) identifies them.

⁶⁷ *Caes. BC* 1.22.4.

⁶⁸ *BMCRR* 1.542 [and 544, nos. 4135–6, 4143–8 = Sydenham, *RRC* 177, nos. 1056–7 = Crawford, *RRC* 1.488, nos. 480/2–3]. Caesar also became augur, apparently in 47 BC: Cass. Dio 42.51.4.

⁶⁹ Above, n. 55.

⁷⁰ Cass. Dio 44.5.3. This is accepted by Carcopino, *Histoire romaine*, 1002 and even by Münzer, *RA* 361. Some will still prefer to stand by Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II, 1106.

⁷¹ For these phrases, see above, n. 45.

Cicero's Change of Plan (August 7, 44 BC)

[1] Since the meeting of the Senate in the Temple of Tellus on March 17 Cicero had taken no active part in the political life of Rome. Not once, indeed, had he set foot within the Curia. From shunning Rome it was for Cicero a short step to quitting Italy. After long doubt and wavering he at last put into execution his project of departing to Greece. Cicero left Pompeii on July 17 and reached Syracuse on August 1. Then he was delayed by contrary weather and thrown back to Leucopetra, in the vicinity of Rhegium on August 6. There he spent the night. On the following day men of Rhegium [2] recently in Rome brought him important intelligence. This induced him to abandon his design and set about returning to the capital and to political activity.

Events of which he had no knowledge when at Leucopetra were to reveal that his decision was a grave miscalculation. If the facts that determined Cicero's course of action can be satisfactorily established, the result may be to illuminate, not merely an episode in his life of the great orator but some part at least of the political transactions and intrigues of late July and early August, 44 BC, obscure as they are in themselves and disputed in chronology. This was a turning point in the fortunes of Caesar's heir, the young adventurer Octavian.

[3] From Cicero himself we possess two accounts of his changed decision, in a letter written to Atticus nearly a fortnight later (*Att.* 16.7; August 19), and in the *First Philippic* (delivered on September 2). The more valuable of these two documents is clearly the letter: it was written two days after Cicero had met Brutus at Velia (August 17) and had learned from him certain political events unknown to him at the time of his decision to return. Too late! This being so, it cannot be taken as certain that Cicero's subsequent accounts of the reasons that influenced him at Leucopetra on August 7 are complete, consistent, and unequivocal.

These reasons may now be briefly indicated. According to the *First Philippic* (§ 8) the first piece of news that made him think of returning was a speech of Antony, delivered [4] before the people at Rome: then a manifesto of Brutus and Cassius arrived, which he found very reasonable, *plenum aequitatis*. His informants also added, on their own authority, that there was to be a full

meeting of the Senate on August 1 and that Antony would give up the Gallic provinces—*rem conventuram: Kalendis Sextilibus*¹ *senatum frequentem fore; Antonium, repudiatis malis suasoribus, remissis provinciis Galliis, ad auctoritatem senatus esse rediturum* [‘that a settlement would be reached; that there was to be a full meeting of the Senate on August 1; and that Antony would renounce his wicked advisors, relinquish the provincial commands in the Gauls, and return to the authoritative guidance of the Senate’]. This welcome news, Cicero says, impelled him to set out with all speed.

The letter to Atticus provides substantially the same reasons. It will be advantageous to quote them (*Att.* 16.7.1): *haec adferebant, edictum Bruti et Cassi, et fore frequentem senatum Kalendis, a Bruto et Cassio litteras missas ad consularis et praetorios ut adessent rogare. summam spem nuntiabant fore ut Antonius cederet, res conveniret, [5] nostri Romam redirent*. [‘They brought news as follows: an edict of Brutus and Cassius, a full meeting of the Senate to take place on the 1st, letters sent by Brutus and Cassius to the former consuls and praetors, asking them to attend. They announced the highest hopes that Antony would give way, a settlement would be reached, and that our friends would return to Rome’].

The letter, be it noted, makes no mention of any speech of Antony. On the other hand, it reveals a significant fact and a significant opinion. Brutus and Cassius had sent out letters requesting the consulars and praetorians to be present at the sitting of August 1; and, if all went well on that day, the Liberators might be able to return to Rome.

It is therefore of cardinal importance to determine what Cicero can have known and what he cannot have known on August 7 at Leucopetra. Is there any gap or deception in the chronology which he supplies? From Cicero, we get, both in the letter and in the *First Philippic*, the impression of a rapid decision, in the *Philippic* (but not in the letter), of an immediate departure following the decision. Is the record [6] true? Certain indications might appear to suggest a doubt at least.

According to the *Philippic* Cicero at Leucopetra received first of all the speech (otherwise unknown) of Antony: the letter supplies the date, namely 7 August 7. Then, ‘not long after’, came the manifesto of Brutus and Cassius—*nec ita multo post edictum Bruti adfertur et Cassi*. Is there an interval of time there, perhaps of a day or two? Apparently not, however, for the letter dates the receipt of this manifesto to the same day, August 7. Secondly, the letter

[1] ¹ Since Madvig, most standard editions of the *Philippics* (e.g. Teubner and the O.C.T.) follow his suggestion and delete the word *Sextilibus*. Wrongly, for reference is clearly to the 1st of August, as many scholars have seen (Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*, I², 104; Tyrrell and Purser, *The Correspondence of Cicero* V [Dublin and London 1897] 402; Rice Holmes, *The Architect of the Roman Empire*, I [Oxford 1928] 197–8). The hesitation of How (*Cicero: Select Letters*, II, Notes, [Oxford 1926] 497–8) is difficult to understand.

goes on to mention the receipt of a letter from Atticus,² which confirmed Cicero in the decision he had made. When did this letter reach him? Possibly on August 7, but for all that can be known, at any time between August 7 and 17. There is no clear indication. Thirdly, according to the *Philippic*, Cicero sailed north at once and with all speed. *Tum vero tanta sum cupiditate [7] incensus ad reditum ut mihi nulli neque remi neque venti satis facerent, non quo me ad tempus occurrurum non putarem, sed ne tardius quam cuperem rei publicae gratularer. atque ego celeriter Veliam devectus Brutum vidi: quanto meo dolore non dico.*³ If this means that Cicero left at once, he ought surely to have reached Velia earlier than August 17, for the distance from Rhegium to Velia is only some [140] miles in a straight line: ten days should not have been required from this voyage. Either Cicero grossly exaggerates the speed of his return—note especially the emphatic *atque ego*: or, he really lurked at Leucopetra for some days longer, say till August 11 or 12. An interval of doubt and delay fits better the character of Cicero than a prompt decision at Leucopetra on August 7 and immediate embarkation.

[8] The purpose of insisting upon this possibility is not to convict Cicero of error or mendacity—it is to determine the latest possible date at which Cicero might have received information from Rome before the irrevocable decision was taken and the vessel turned its prow northwards. For safety, August 11 or 12 rather than August 7 may be admitted as a terminus.

So much for the margin of time. To understand the full significance of Cicero's changed decision, the reasons for this original project of leaving Italy must be borne well in mind.

The disillusionment that descended upon the veteran statesman so soon after the Ides of March was deepened by the events of the first week of June. On the second or third day of the month the consul Antony secured the passing of the *Lex de permutatione provinciarum*,⁴ by the term of which [9] he received the Gallic provinces instead of Macedonia, while retaining the Macedonian legions (or at least five of them), and a prolongation of the provincial command to five years. Brutus and Cassius, however, were allotted on June 5 an honorific and harmless corn-commission in Sicily and Achaëa. Cicero's meeting with the Liberators at the conference of Antium (June 8)⁵

² Cic. Att. 16.7.2: *lectis vero tuis litteris admiratus equidem sum te tam vehementer sententiam commutasse, sed non sine causa arbitrabar* ['when I read your letter I was very surprised to see that you had changed your opinion so drastically, but I thought you must have had good reason for that'].

³ [Cic. Phil. 1.9: 'But at this point I was inflamed with such eagerness to return, that no oars or winds could be enough for me; not that I thought that I should not arrive in time, but lest I should be later than I wished in congratulating the commonwealth. And I quickly arrived at Velia, where I saw Brutus; I cannot say how grieved I was.']

⁴ On this question now cf. Rice Holmes, *Architect*, I, 192–6; M. A. Levi, *Ottaviano capoparte*, I (Florence 1933) 77–9.

⁵ Cic. Att. 15.11.

brought him no comfort, and by the beginning of the next month he came nearer the decision to depart. Moreover, reports that reached Italy early in July indicated that Sex. Pompey in Spain was ready to lay down his arms and come to terms with the government in Rome⁶—a blow to the Liberators: and Cicero did not want Sex. Pompey to disarm.⁷ Then the Ludi Apollinares (July 13–20)—turned out to be a frost—Brutus, though absent, expected popular demonstrations in his favour.⁸ So it was to be expected that Brutus and Cassius would leave Italy: and Cicero set sail from Pompeii on July 17.⁹ The domination of Antony [10] appeared securely established, at least until the beginning of the next year and the consulate of the moderate Caesarians Hirtius and Pansa. For that, Cicero said, he would return. Yet such a course might appear rather silly, he says—*relinquimus enim pacem ut ad bella revertamur*.¹⁰

So Cicero, on July 17, when leaving Pompeii for the straits of Rhegium and the voyage to Greece. What happened to convert him from despair to hope?

First of all, his own account. A speech of Antony delighted him:¹¹ it is not mentioned in the Correspondence or in any other source. Of its tenor and tone there can be only conjecture. The speech can hardly have been other than conciliatory towards the Liberators. This was nothing new—the consul's public utterances had hitherto shown every consideration towards Brutus and Cassius. More important surely was the manifesto, [11] which Cicero describes as *plenum aequitatis*. Here a difficulty arises—which manifesto? For several were promulgated in this period of intensive propaganda, more perhaps than we have heard of.

Now Velleius mentions edicts in which Brutus and Cassius announced their readiness to leave Italy for ever and live in exile rather than be an occasion for civil war.¹² Many scholars have identified these edicts with the edict *plenum*

⁶ Cic. Att. 15.27.1 (6 July); 16.1.4 (8 July); 16.4.1 (10 July).

⁷ Cic. Att. 15.29.1: *Sextum scutum abicere nolebam* ['I did not want to throw away the shield Sextus'].]

[2] ⁸ Cic. Att. 16.5.3 etc.

⁹ Cic. Att. 16.3. ¹⁰ Cic. Att. 16.3.4.

¹¹ Cic. Phil. 1.8: *a quibus primum accipio M. Antoni contionem, quae mihi ita placuit, ut, ea lecta, de reversione primum coeperim cogitare* ['from them I first received the text of Mark Antony's public speech; I liked it so much that, after reading it, I first began to think about heading back.'].]

¹² Vell. 2.62.3: *quippe M. Brutus et C. Cassius, nunc metuentes arma Antonii, nunc ad augendam eius invidiam simulantes se metuere, testati edictis libenter se vel in perpetuo exilio victuros, dum rei publicae constaret concordia, nec ullam belli civilis praebituros materiam, plurimum sibi honoris esse in conscientia facti sui, profecti urbe atque Italia, [3] intento ac pari animo sine auctoritate publica provincias exercitusque occupaverant et, ubicumque ipsi essent, praetextentes esse rem publicam, pecunias etiam, quae ex transmarinis provinciis Romam ab quaestoribus deportabantur, a volentibus acceperant* ['It is true that these two men had issued manifestoes—at first in real fear of armed violence at the hands of Antony, and later to increase Antony's unpopularity, with the pretence of fear—manifestos in which they declared that for the sake of ensuring harmony in the republic they were even ready to live in perpetual exile, that they would furnish no grounds for civil war, and that the consciousness of the service they had rendered by their act was ample reward. But, when they had once left Rome and Italy behind them, by deliberate agreement and without government sanction they had taken possession of provinces and armies, and under the pretence that the republic existed wherever they were, they

aequitatis that changed Cicero at Leucopetra. On this side stand recent and reputable authorities like Gelzer, Rice Holmes, and Levi.¹³ But Velleius' account might be regarded as quite general in character, resumptive of several edicts,—note the plural, *edictis*—and, as Denniston has forcibly argued,¹⁴ probably contains a reference to an edict published at a time when Brutus was in fact quitting Italy (late August?). Denniston's arguments may be accepted and reinforced. Cicero, it is pertinent to note, approves of the manifesto: and the [12] Rhegine friends of the orator fancied that there was now a chance that the Liberators might return to Rome—*nostri Romam redirent*.¹⁵ Now the corn-commission of June 5 was not at all to the taste of Brutus and Cassius: and Cicero at Antium had given expression to the wish that they could be at Rome if only their lives would be safe.¹⁶ This is important. It follows that an announcement of their intended departure from Italy would in no way have elated Cicero. The 'very reasonable manifesto' must have indicated a desire to return, not to depart. Moreover, Brutus and Cassius sent letters to the senators of consular and praetorian standing requesting their presence in the Curia on August 1—superfluous surely and pointless if their edict merely announced an intention of doing that which they had every right under the terms of their commission, namely to depart from Italy.

[12a] It follows that at least three edicts were promulgated in July and August, firstly the very reasonable edict which Cicero read at Leucopetra, secondly the extant manifesto published at Naples on August 4, thirdly the manifesto which Velleius reports and of which echoes survive—namely the intention of the Liberators to provide no occasion for civil war and their boast that where they were, there was the Republic.¹⁷

[13] The tenor of the edict here in question is not recorded. It may have contained a request that the Liberators should be permitted to surrender the corn-commission;¹⁸ to return to Rome for the remainder of the year of offices; to have important provinces allotted to them. We do not know; and here is an added snare—perhaps the words of the manifesto were one thing, its true purpose another. Perhaps it was not at all an honest proposal for the

had gone so far as to receive from the quaestors, with their own consent, it is true, the moneys which these men were conveying to Rome from the provinces across the sea', trans. F. W. Shipley] (for echoes of the phraseology in Cicero, see *Phil.* 2.113; 10.8).

¹³ M. Gelzer, *RE X*, 1, s.v. M. Iunius Brutus, 998; Rice Holmes, *Architect*, I, 267 (in criticism of J. D. Denniston, edition of *Philippics* I–II, 76–7); Levi, *Ottaviano capoparte*, I, 106.

¹⁴ Edition of Cicero, *Philippics* I–II (Oxford 1926) 76–7. Add *Phil.* 10.8: *eundem vidi postea Velliae cedentem Italia, ne qua oreretur belli civilis causa propter se* ['I saw him again afterwards at Vellia, as he was departing from Italy, in order that he might offer no pretext for civil war'].

¹⁵ *Cic. Att.* 16.7.1; Denniston, *o.c.*

¹⁶ *Cic. Att.* 15.11.1; cf. 14.20.3 (May 11).

¹⁷ Cf. *Cic. Phil.* 10.8; 2.113: *qui ubicumque terrarum sunt, ibi omne est rei publicae praesidium vel potius ipsa res publica* ['wherever they are, there is all the defence of the commonwealth, or indeed, there is the commonwealth itself']. Compare Vell. 2.62.3, quoted above, n. 12.

[4] ¹⁸ Cf. Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*, I², 430–1.

establishment of public concord, but merely a move to embarrass Antony. If Antony could be provoked to reprisals and threats, that might rob him of support in moderate circles. On the other hand, renewed gestures of conciliation from Antony towards the assassins of Caesar would alienate him from the favour of the veterans, impaired already for this same reason, and encourage the adventurer Octavian in his feud with the consul.

[14] The manifesto, whatever its content and purpose, is a fact. All that we can hope to know is its effect upon Cicero—and both he and his Rhegine friends may have been deceived into believing that a piece of propaganda was a serious proposal. Cicero was also deeply impressed by the opinions reproduced by the men of Rhegium—*summam spem nuntiabant fore ut Antonius cederet, res conveniret, nostri Romam redirent*.¹⁹

What was the justification of these sanguine hopes? What additional information was Cicero in a position to acquire on August 7—or shall we say, by August 12 (cf. [above, p. 198]). This is a question of some importance, for it concerns the policy of Brutus and Cassius likewise. Granted that their edict contained honest and salutary proposals, the same events as caused Cicero to return may have modified the attitude which the Liberators had taken up after the grant of the corn-commission and the [15] failure of the Ludi Apollinares to sway popular sentiment in their favour.

The historian Cassius Dio summarily attributes Cicero's return to the breach between Antony and Octavian.²⁰ There is something in this. There was a chance in late July of mobilising an attack against Antony from several fronts at once. It is therefore necessary to make enquiry about the developments in Roman politics that may have come to Cicero's knowledge at Leucopetra. This a problem of unusual intricacy, for the fullest source for the tangled politics of June, July, and August is the Civil Wars of Appian: and Appian at this point is both tendentious and confused in chronology. Much of what will be suggested in the following remarks can from the nature of the case be only conjectural.

[16] In one question of moment, however, the ground can be cleared in advance. On 1 August the distinguished L. Calpurnius Piso, the father-in-law of the Dictator, criticised the policy of Antony.²¹ It has sometimes been supposed that Piso's attack was known to Cicero at Leucopetra and contributed to his decision. So, recently, Levi and Charlesworth.²² Three reasons tell against this view. Firstly, the distance. It is nearly four hundred miles from

¹⁹ Cic. Att. 16.7.1 ['They conveyed their most fervid hope that Antony would budge, that an agreement would be reached, and that our men would return to Rome'].

²⁰ Cass. Dio 45.15.4: ἐπανήλθεν ἐπειδήπερ ἐκπεπολεμωμένους σφῶς ᾔσθετο.

²¹ Cic. Att. 16.7.5 and 7; Phil. 1.10 and 14; 5.19; Fam. 12.2.1.

²² M. P. Charlesworth, 'The Avenging of Caesar', *CAH X* (Cambridge 1934) 1–30, at 10: 'here [scil. at Leucopetra] the news of an attack made by L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in the Senate on August 1... induced him to return'. Levi, *Ottaviano capoparte*, I, 109, after narrating Piso's attack says that Cicero 'quando apprese il mutamento di situazione decise di tornare in Italia'.

Rome to Rhegium. To be sure, news *could* have been transmitted in time to reach Cicero, [9] especially on the hypothesis that he stayed at Leucopetra for some days after August 7. But none of Cicero's would-be informants in Rome or in the vicinity of Rome would have known where to find him at this time. Secondly, Cicero states that he first learned of Piso's attack from Brutus at Velia on August 17.²³ Thirdly, Piso's attack was a failure. Knowledge of this fiasco would [17] hardly have spurred Cicero to return. As he says himself, after this his return had neither point nor purpose.²⁴

It may well have been known in advance, however, that Piso (and other consulars?) were intending to oppose Antony on August 1. Piso himself was an honest man, not given to dissimulation, as is satisfactorily attested by his firm attitude after Caesar's death, when he insisted on due burial for the Dictator,²⁵ and by his no less firm stand for concord and negotiation with Antony rather than a civil war in the early days of the year 43.²⁶

It is now time to indicate certain factors in the Roman political situation late in July, not mentioned by Cicero in this context but probably of some influence in swaying his decision.

[18] (1) The *Ludi Victoriae Caesaris* (July 20–30). These games, celebrated by Octavian in fine style with the aid of several friends of the Dictator, contributed by their success as a political manifestation to the rapid rise of Octavian as a Caesarian party-leader at the expense of Antonius. One manoeuvre the consul was able to frustrate, it is true, the exhibition of the Dictator's *sella curulis*. Against the stars he fought in vain. In the course of the games a comet appeared in the northern sky²⁷—the soul of Caesar now divine. Most distasteful and alarming to Antony, who had shown no disposition to promote either the cult or the avenging of Caesar. Octavian conceived high hopes, and the enemies of Octavian had occasion for short-sighted rejoicings.

[19] (2) A rumour about the tribunate. Nowhere alluded to by Cicero, this mysterious incident is recorded by Appian, Dio, Suetonius, and Plutarch²⁸—in no satisfactory or consistent fashion. The most explicit account is that of Appian. Appian states that Octavian's support of the candidature of a certain Flaminius encouraged among the populace the persuasion that Octavian might seek for himself a seat among the tribunes. This provoked the intervention of Antony and exacerbated the relations between the consul and Caesar's heir. The other authorities speak of a definite candidature of Octavian—according to Dio in the place of the dead tribune Cinna. Everything, including the date, is uncertain about these manoeuvres. Suetonius' account is quite general. The chronology in Appian, unfortunately, is quite obscure, but

²³ Cic. *Phil.* 1.10; cf. *Att.* 16.7.5.

²⁴ Cic. *Att.* 16.7.7. ²⁵ App. *BC* 2.135–6.

²⁶ App. *BC* 3.50 and 54–61; Cic. *Phil.* 12.15, etc. [5] ²⁷ Cass. Dio 45.7.1; Plin. *Nat.* 2.94.

²⁸ App. *BC* 3.31; Cass. Dio 45.6.2–3; Suet. *Aug.* 10.2; Plut. *Ant.* 16.1.

shows at least that the incident is later than the beginning of June. Plutarch and Dio place it before the [20] *Ludi Victoriae Caesaris* (July 20–30). As may well be understood, modern authorities vary widely.²⁹ Most provide no clear indication of opinion, one or two favour early August or even go so far as the end of September. But the end of September is probably much too late. Given the nature of the evidence, no attempt at close dating is justifiable. To place the incident in July would not be in flagrant contradiction with any of the known evidence and would fit the political situation well enough.

(3) The betrothal of Octavian. Suetonius alone records the betrothal of Octavian to a daughter of the distinguished consular P. Servilius Isauricus.³⁰ The only other fact known about this connection is that it was dissolved in the autumn of 43 BC at the time of the formation of the Triumvirate, when Claudia, a daughter of Antony's wife Fulvia, was affianced to Octavian. There is no indication of date in Suetonius. [21] Münzer inclines to August of 43 BC.³¹ But nothing forbids the conjecture that the betrothal was a part—an integral part, perhaps—of certain political intrigues of July, 44. Nor is some confirmation lacking. Nicolaus of Damascus mentions *Publius* among the politicians who lent encouragement to Caesar's heir at a quite early date.³² Whenever it happened, a dynastic union of this kind was a political event. Though it was to the favour of Caesar that Servilius owed his consulate (48 BC) and his proconsulate of Asia (46–44 BC), he was a moderate in politics: moreover, he had ties with the Liberators, his brothers-in-law. Another of his sisters was married to Lepidus. This consular could command no little political influence. On September 2 he followed Cicero's lead in speaking against Antony³³ and on January 1 of the next year he was the author of the most extreme proposal for conferring honours upon [22] Octavian.³⁴ This suggests at least that the betrothal is not to be dated as late as August, 43 BC. If P. Servilius Isauricus as well as L. Piso stood against him, Antony had reason to pause. It is to be regretted that more is not known of the political activity of other consulars in July. Octavian's relatives, his stepfather L. Marcius Philippus (*cos.* 56 BC) and his brother-in-law, the sinister C. Marcellus, C. f. (*cos.* 50 BC), may have taken a hand.

²⁹ Rice Holmes, *Architect*, I, 26; Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*, IV, 268; G. Niccolini, *I fasti dei tribuni della plebe* (Milan 1934) 352—all indefinite. Tyrrell and Purser, *The Correspondence of Cicero*, V, lxxxix, appear to favour early August; Levi, *Ottaviano capoparte* I, 103, to judge by his narrative, late July? M. P. Charlesworth (*CAH* X, 11) appears to date this incident in late September or early October, after Antony's setting up of a statue of Caesar with the dedication *Parenti optime merito*. This seems too late.

³⁰ Suet. *Aug.* 62.1; for this repudiation, cf. Cass. Dio 46.56.3.

³¹ *RE*, s.v. P. Servilius (Isauricus), 1801.

³² Nic. Dam. 28.110; cf. E. Schwartz, 'Zu Nikolaos von Damaskos Biographie von Augustus', *Hermes* 23 (1898), 184.

³³ Cic. *Fam.* 12.2.1.

[6] ³⁴ Cic. *Ep. M. Brut.* 1.15.7.

(4) The quarrel between Antony and Octavian. Apparent at their first confrontation and steadily growing, the tension between the consul and Caesar's heir reached a height with the success of Octavian's games. Antony's opposition served only to excite feeling.³⁵ The manoeuvres about the tribunate may also, perhaps, be dated to the month of July (see above, p. 202–3). There [23] appeared to every danger of an irreparable split in the Caesarian faction. The interaction of the soldiery subsequently brought about a solemn and public reconciliation between Antony and Octavian, staged upon the Capitol.³⁶ Appian, again the fullest source, does not enable one to date this incident closely. Early August? So, apparently, the best recent accounts of the history of the period.³⁷ If so, the breach was known to Cicero at Leucopetra—but not the healing of the breach.

It needs hardly be repeated that much in the above reconstruction is hazardous and conjectural. If a part only is accepted, it will be enough to finish the necessary supplement to Cicero's own statements. As a historical source the letters of Cicero are unique in value. But they cannot be expected to contain everything. Moreover, since his departure from [24] Pompeii on July 17 to his arrival at Leucopetra on August 6, Cicero had been out of the reach of his correspondents: and the first letter that he received from Atticus appears to have reached him at some time later than August 7 (cf. [above, p. 198]).

The interval had witnessed certain developments in politics. At Leucopetra Cicero had cognisance of significant facts—not merely what he records himself, the speech of Antony, the manifesto of the Liberators, their request that consulars and praetorians should attend the Senate on 1 August and the hopes thereby engendered. No, more than this perhaps and more solid justification for his complete change of plan. The situation in Rome was wondrous and confused.³⁸ Yet all seemed to conspire—the widening rift in the Caesarian faction, the growing popularity of the young adventurer Octavian, the intention of L. Piso to oppose Antony in the Senate. [25] Now perhaps was first adumbrated Cicero's darling and ill-starred idea—the coalition against Antony of Octavian, of moderate Caesarians and of Republicans.

Hence the high hopes of Cicero. They were dashed to the ground when he reached Velia on August 17 and was apprised of subsequent events. The combined manoeuvres against Antony had collapsed. In the Senate Piso had

³⁵ Cf. esp. App. BC 3.28: τότε δὴ καὶ μάλιστα μῖσος ἤδη σαφές ἐκ πάντων ἐς τὸν Ἀντώνιον ἐγίγνετο [‘then it became clear that a hatred of Antony was already emerging from all quarters’].

³⁶ App. BC 3.28–9; Nic. Dam. 29; Cass. Dio 45.8.2; Plut. *Ant.* 16. Nowhere is there an unequivocal indication of date.

³⁷ Levi, *Ottaviano capoparte* I, 103–4 and Charlesworth in *CAH* X, 10—such as least is his date which their narrative indicates without stating precisely. Cf. also Rice Holmes, *Architect*, I, 19: late July or early August?

³⁸ Cf. his description in Nic. Dam. 28.111: πολυπρόσωπός τις ἦν καὶ ἀλλόκοτος παραχῇ [‘a many-faced and extraordinary upheaval’].

received no support. Antony, for his part, perhaps from impatience, perhaps suspecting, and not unnaturally, an attempt to discredit him in the war of propaganda, had replied to the manifesto of Brutus and Cassius in an unfriendly spirit.³⁹ To this they retort in a dignified manifesto from Naples, dated August 4.⁴⁰ Further, about this time Antony secured that they should be allotted Crete and Cyrene as their provinces.⁴¹—no better, to be sure, than the [26] unwelcome corn-commission. An essential part of the calculation of Antony's enemies was the split in the Caesarian faction. The reconciliation may perhaps belong to the last days of July or the very beginning of August. If so, this too would now be known to Cicero at Velia.

And so Cicero's change of plan turned out to have been all in vain. None the less he persisted in the return to Rome, with a heavy heart. It was not, as when he sailed northwards from Leucopetra, in the hope of a reversal of affairs in Rome and renewed participation in politics at last. His own words best reveal his deception. *Nec ego nunc, ut Brutus censebat, istuc ad rem publicam capessendam venio. Quid enim fieri potest? Num quis Pisoni est adsensus? Num rediit ipse postridie? Sed abesse hanc aetatem longe a sepulcro negant.*⁴²

³⁹ Cic. Att. 16.7.7; cf. Fam. 11.3.

⁴⁰ Cic. Fam. 11.3.

⁴¹ Probably on 1 August, cf. Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms* IV, 34; if not, at least very soon after.

⁴² Cic. Att. 16.7.7 ['Nor am I returning to Rome in order to take part in politics, as Brutus recommended. What after all can be done? Did anybody support Piso? Did he come back himself the next day? However, they say that men of my age should not go far away from their graves.']

Nicolaus of Damascus XXVIII and XXXI

[1] The *Vita Caesaris* of the polymath Nicolaus, preserved in the fragments of a Byzantine epitome, is apologetic and fraudulent as well as confused and defective. Its value for history is therefore indirect rather than direct. As Nicolaus made use of the Autobiography of Augustus, his work presents no little interest to the student of sources; further, it reveals the choice of colour, grouping, and emphasis that an adulatory and astute publicist considered more serviceable to his ends; and lastly, in the full account of the upbringing of the young Octavius under the care of his mother Atia, Nicolaus wins a place among the exponents of the theory of education.¹

[2] In spite of this alarming conspiracy of suspect motives, Nicolaus does manage to provide certain facts otherwise unknown. He states that at Brundisium in April of the year 44 BC his young hero acquired temporary charge of certain public monies and revenues from the eastern provinces, which, however, he duly paid into the Treasury at Rome, being content with his own patrimony.² If true, this is important; if not, at least an apologist's reply to an Antonian counter-attack in another allegation about public funds, the notorious and mysterious seven hundred million sesterces laid up at the Temple of Ops. Again, according to Nicolaus, L. Marcus Censorinus and C. Calvisius Sabinus were the only Caesarian partisans who made any attempt to defend the Dictator from his assassins.³ This is credible; if believed, it shows the consulate of these two men in 39 BC as a public manifesto of the Caesarian party, triumphant and reunited after the Pact of Brundisium.

[15] ¹ On this see especially R. Laqueur, *RE*, s. v. Nikolaos, 407–10. The reference to Atia in the *Dialogus* of Tacitus (28: *sic Atiam Augusti praefuisse educationibus*), which, Laqueur claims, had not hitherto been noted, will be found in R. Duttlinger, *Untersuchungen über den historischen Wert des Bios Kaisaros des Nicolaus Damascenus* (Diss. Heidelberg 1911) 49.

² Nic. Dam. 18.55 Jacoby. Note also on this point Cass. Dio 45.3 and App. BC 3.11. B. R. Motzo has developed the limits of our sources: 'Antonio, Ottaviano e il tesoro di Cesare', *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia della Regia Università di Cagliari* (1933), 1–24.

³ Nic. Dam. 23.96.

[3] Yet it will not do to rehabilitate beyond measure the accuracy, still less the veracity, of Nicolaus.⁴ The harsh strictures of Ed. Schwartz are pertinent and deserved:⁵ he really does not cast much light upon the events of 44 BC. As history has all too often been written in times ancient and modern, the rise of Octavianus appears predestined and inevitable. That is a pragmatic and unhistorical view. The best of contemporary evidence, the Correspondence of Cicero, is a salutary warning. The young man was the heir to Caesar's name and private fortune, nothing else. At his earliest appearance in Campania in April of the year he excited no great attention and was not regarded as a political factor of any moment. *De Octavio susque deque*.⁶

How did the adventurer make his way, securing devoted adherents, a private army, the *auctoritas* of senior statesmen and ultimate legitimation? Here Nicolaus is of some help. He describes how Octavianus, at variance with Antonius, who would give him [4] no help towards the avenging of Caesar but respected the amnesty accorded to the assassins, received support from certain neutrals, eager to embitter the quarrel between him and the consul: the principal of them were Publius, Vibius, Lucius, and especially Cicero.⁷

These names demand brief investigation. The first two clearly represent P. Servilius Isauricus (*cos.* 48) and the consul designate, C. Vibius Pansa Caetronianus. Who is 'Lucius'? The search is complicated by the deplorable and traditional Greek delusion about Roman *praenomina*. One might think of Octavianus' stepfather, L. Marcus Philippus, who certainly played an ambiguous rôle in these transactions: but he has been mentioned already by Nicolaus more than once, as Philippus. Possibly L. Cornelius Balbus, who, according to Nicolaus, had supported Lepidus' proposal for immediate vengeance upon the assassins:⁸ but Balbus was not a senator and, for all his political importance, which lay behind the scenes, hardly perhaps to be reckoned along with consulars among the *κορυφαῖοι*. Hall in his [5] edition of the *Vita Caesaris* proposes to identify Lucius as L. Julius Caesar (*cos.* 64), the

⁴ As by R. Duttlinger in his Heidelberg dissertation.

⁵ 'Die Vertheilung der römischen Provinzen nach Caesars Tod', *Hermes* 33 (1898), 185–244, at 211–12. He describes Nicolaus' work as a 'fratzenhafte Zerrbild'.

[16] ⁶ Cic. *Att.* 14.6.1 (April 12).

⁷ Nic. Dam. 28.110 Jacoby: ἦσαν δ' οἱ ἐν μέσῳ τὴν ἔχθραν ἀνάγοντες αὐτῶν καὶ πράττοντες τοῦτο. τούτων δ' ἦσαν κορυφαῖοι Πόπλιος, Οὐίβιος, Λεύκιος, πάντων δὲ μάλιστα Κικέρων. Καίσαρ δὲ οὐκ ἀγνοῶν ὄντινα τρόπον αὐτῷ συνίασιν οὗτοι παροξύνοντες ἐπὶ Ἀντώνιον, οὐ διωθεῖτο, ὥπως αὐτῶν τὴν βοήθειαν φυλακὴν τε ἐρρωμενεστέραν περὶ ἑαυτὸν καταστήσοιτο [There were others who, from a middle ground, tried to foment enmity between them, and did so. The chief of these were the following men: Publius, Vibius, Lucius and especially Cicero. Octavianus was not ignorant of the reason why they associated themselves with him, trying to provoke him against Antonius, but he did not repel them, for he wished to have their assistance and a more powerful guard thrown around him', trans. C. M. Hall, modified].

⁸ Nic. Dam. 27.106.

uncle of Antonius.⁹ His reasons are not conclusive. L. Caesar was certainly discontented with the behaviour of his nephew;¹⁰ and he adopted a Republican but moderate attitude in the senatorial debates early in the following year. In 44 BC, however, there is no record of any activity at all in his part—he was impeded by bad health.¹¹ Further, here is the best of negative evidence, from contemporary sources. In the Second *Philippic* Cicero praises L. Caesar for his patriotic attitude at the time of the Catilinarian affair, with pointed and personal rebuke of Antonius:¹² no word of anything more recent. Cicero again, writing to Cassius at the end of September or early in October, runs through the list of the senior statesmen.¹³ The consulars who had openly opposed Antonius were L. Calpurnius Piso (*cos.* 58), P. Servilius, and himself. Piso had spoken in the Senate on 1 August, without receiving any support. [6] Servilius followed Cicero on 2 September. We revert with satisfaction and with confidence to the opinion of Schwartz—Lucius is L. Piso.¹⁴

So far so good. The value of Nicolaus' evidence is another question. His notice is brief and chronologically inadequate, appearing to belong to the interval (surely very brief) between the *Ludi Victoriae Caesaris* (July 20–30) and the public reconciliation on the Capitol between Antonius and Octavianus, at a time when one of the four, Cicero, had not yet returned to Rome. Moreover, it lumps together persons of divergent antecedents, position, and aims. One is surprised to find Pansa, who was the son-in-law of the Antonian Q. Fufius Calenus, and not the other consul-designate, whose policy is with difficulty to be distinguished from that of Pansa. Perhaps this is a part of the tradition—or invention—which made Pansa, on his deathbed, warn Octavianus against the Senate and counsel him to join the Caesarians.¹⁵

[7] Pansa, like Hirtius, was a moderate Caesarian, alarmed by the pretensions of Antonius, loyal to the memory of Caesar, and inclined to look with favour on Caesar's heir. L. Piso was a Republican and a neutral, averse from Antonius but distasteful of Cicero, Servilius was probably playing for his own band, while Cicero before long was to be the veritable *κορυφαῖος* in the ruinous

⁹ C. M. Hall, *Nicolaus of Damascus' Life of Augustus*, Smith College Classical Studies (Northampton, Mass. 1923) 93.

¹⁰ Cic. *Att.* 14.17.3; 17a.3 = *Fam.* 9.4.3 (May 2).

¹¹ Cic. *Fam.* 12.2.3: *L. Cotta, familiaris meus, fatali quadam desperatione, ut ait, minus in senatum venit; L. Caesar, optimus et fortissimus civis, valetudine impeditur* ['My friend L. Cotta is coming less often to Senate out of a sort of irrepressible despair, as he puts it; L. Caesar, an excellent and most courageous citizen, is hindered by his health']. Also the letters cited above, n. 10.

[17] ¹² Cic. *Phil.* 2.14.

¹³ Cic. *Fam.* 12.2. The passage referring to L. Caesar is quoted above, n. [10].

¹⁴ E. Schwartz, 'Zu Nikolaos von Damaskos Biographie des Kaisers Augustus', *Hermes* 33 (1898), 182–4, at 184.

¹⁵ App. *BC* 3.75.

policy of raising up Octavianus to destroy Antonius and the Caesarian party. Nicolaus adds nothing.

That does not hold for the other passage where he gives the names of certain individuals, this time active partisans of Octavianus in his earliest illicit and revolutionary adventures, Nicolaus describes the tour in Campania in October and the raising of a private army for the first march on Rome, with the names of five associates: καὶ ταῦτα αὐτῷ βουλευομένῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις συνεδόκει φίλοις οἱ μετεῖχον στρατείας τῶν τε μετὰ ταῦτα πραγμάτων. ἦσαν δὲ οὗτοι Μάρκος Ἀγρίππας, + Λεύκιος Μ<α>κρήνας, Κόιντος Ιουέντιος, Μάρκος Μοδιάλιος καὶ Λεύκιος (31, 133 Jacoby ['In this plan and in the events that followed, he had the approval of the friends of his that took part in the campaign. These were: Marcus Agrippa, Lucius Maecenas, Quintus Juventius, Marcus Modialius, and Lucius']).

Agrippa is in his place and rôle—Nicolaus has already mentioned that he was a schoolfellow of Octavianus.¹⁶ Lucius Maecenas, who is he? Perhaps the father of the notorious C. Maecenas.¹⁷ But, given the errors to which an epitomator—and the author himself—are so evidently liable, this may well be a mistake for C. Maecenas. Furthermore, these men had also a share in subsequent transactions (τῶν τε μετὰ ταῦτα πραγμάτων) which hardly fits the parent of Maecenas.

How far can this criticism be adduced in sifting the other names? That is the question, for none of them offer any grasp. One might be tempted to turn aside from this unpromising material and run through the list of [9] Octavianus' earliest active partisans, in so far as they can be detected. Unfortunately, very few are attested, even as late as the Pact of Brundisium.¹⁸ Certain general principles will emerge, however. Firstly, the men will not have been senators, or, if senators, of the lowest rank, dignity, and, one might almost add, repute. In the earliest years, Octavianus' senatorial following was small and undistinguished. Secondly, the bankers who were supporting Octavianus with funds will not have needed to risk their persons as well. Matius, Saserna, and Rabirius Postumus had helped him to celebrate in lavish style the *Ludi Victoriae Caesaris* as a political demonstration;¹⁹ and the intrigues of Balbus, one of the first persons whom Octavianus met in April,²⁰ will surely be given a place here. Balbus, not a senator at this time, was to receive the consulate in 40 BC.

Octavianus' tour in Campania and march on Rome was an act of violence and treason, recruiting a [10] private army against a consul of the Roman People. His associates in this desperate venture will therefore not have been the most eminent—or most wealthy—of his sympathisers, but those of his partisans who had little to lose and much to gain. One might have expected to

¹⁶ Nic. Dam. 7.16.

¹⁸ [Cf. RR 128–34.]

¹⁷ Münzer, *RE*, s.v. L. Maecenas, 206.

¹⁹ Cic. *Att.* 15.2.3.

²⁰ Cic. *Att.* 14.10.3; 11.2.

find among them persons like M. Mindius Marcellus, who came from the home town of the Octavii, Velitrae.²¹

To return to the three enigmatic names. Lucius seems hopeless, and is best given up, unless one throws a wide hazard and suggests L. Cornificius. This man, an astute careerist of unknown antecedents, prosecuted Brutus under the *Lex Pedia* after the formation of the Triumvirate in 43 BC.²² He later commanded fleets against Sex. Pompeius and became consul for 35 BC. For his naval services, Cornificius earned the right to ride in public on an elephant when returning from banquets.²³ At least, this is the type of person required to fit the bill. Hall argues for L. Cocceius Nerva (*cos. suff.* 39), stating that Nerva 'is mentioned as a trusted friend of Octavian in 41 and thence through his life'.²⁴ That is by no means [11] the case. It is true that he went with Caecina of Volterrae on a mission from Octavianus to Antonius;²⁵ but he stayed behind with Antonius. On this occasion and the next year, when he had a share in negotiating the Pact of Brundisium, he is expressively stated to be a friend of both parties.²⁶ His brother Marcus (*cos.* 34) and C. Cocceius Balbus (perhaps a brother) were certainly Antonians.²⁷ It will scarcely be believed that L. Cocceius Nerva can have remained a friend of Antonius if he had participated in raising an illicit army against him, as one of the earliest active partisans of Octavianus.

Two names remain, Q. Juventius and M. Modialius. The latter name is probably corrupt. Groag conjectures that M. Lollius (*cos.* 21), the famous *homo novus* and military man of the Augustan age, is here to be understood.²⁸ Which may be right. It is to be regretted that nothing is known of his activity before 25 BC, when he turns up as legate of Galatia: nor is his origin attested—possibly a municipal family of Ferentinum.²⁹ As for Q. Juventius, [12] the *praenomen* is not found in that family, and no contemporary member can be adduced as a likely partisan of Octavianus in armed treason. This name too may be corrupt. If so, perhaps Cluentius should stand here. In Orosius the name of (A. or L.) Cluentius, the insurgent leader in the *Bellum Italicum* appears as Juventius.³⁰ This L. Cluentius is presumably a member of that family in the small town of Larinum in Samnium which produced Cicero's not very deserving client A. Cluentius Habitus. It would be a singular and

²¹ Cf. the inscription set up to honour him, as *praefectus classis*, near Velitrae (NSc 1924, 511 = AE 1925, 93 [= *SupIt* 2.5.8]). Mindius, enriched by purchasing confiscated estates under the Dictatorship of Caesar (Cic. *Fam.* 15.17.2) served under Octavianus in his Sicilian war.

²² Plut. *Brut.* 27.

[18] ²³ Cass. Dio 47.7.6.

²⁴ Hall, *Nicolaus of Damascus' Life of Augustus*, 96. ²⁵ App. *BC* 3.60.

²⁶ App. *BC* 5.60: Κοκκήγιος ἐκατέρω φίλος; 64: Κοκκήγιον μὲν ὡς κοινὸν ἀμφοῖν.

²⁷ Cf. *PIR*², svv. ²⁸ Groag, *RE*, s.v. M. Lollius, 1378.

²⁹ Dessau, *ILS* 5432–5.

³⁰ Oros. 5.18.23. The man's *praenomen* appears as 'L.' in Appian (*BC* 1.50), 'A.' in Eutropius (5.3.2).

appropriate chance if another member of that notorious and criminal family turned up an associate of Octavianus.

Another clue points to Larinum. Modialius is an unknown gentile-name. Not so Modius. Now A. Vibius Habitus (*cos. suff.* AD 8) certainly came from Larinum.³¹ Note the *cognomen*, the same as that of Cicero's client. Further, this man had a half-brother, called [13] Q. Modius.³²

This may be only coincidence: and it is evident that such hypotheses and combinations are too insecure and treacherous a foundation for establishing historical truth. The attempt to elucidate Nicolaus, from the nature of the matter, has not yielded much. Yet, as remarked above, the study of Nicolaus is of indirect or negative value. Like Brutus and Cassius at the funeral of Junia, certain characters are splendidly absent—*praeefulgebant Cassius atque Brutus eo ipso quod effigies eorum non visebantur*.³³ One asks—or should have asked—where is Salvidienus Rufus, the greatest of the marshals of the Revolution, senior in years and experience to Agrippa, victor in the War of Perusia, and consul designate for 39 BC though not yet a senator? Along with Agrippa, he was in the company of Caesar's heir in the beginning at Apollonia.³⁴ When M. Brutus wrote to Atticus with complaint of Cicero's policy [14] of supporting Octavianus, his most bitter rebuke was this—Cicero was as bad as Salvidienus.³⁵ Yet Nicolaus does not mention the name of Salvidienus among the partisans and companions of Octavianus or anywhere in his record of the events of 44 BC.

The reason is manifest and palpable. Salvidienus came to grief at the end of 40 BC, for treachery to his friend and leader. The fraudulent, idealising, and educative narration of Nicolaus has omitted this embarrassing character altogether. So much for the candour and veracity of an official and pedagogic historian.

³¹ An inscription of one of his brothers, C. Vibius Postumus, *cos. suff.* AD 5, was found out at Larinum (*CIL* 9.730). Note in the *Pro Cluentio* Sex. Vibius (25) and C. Vibius Capax (165).

³² F. Hiller von Gaertringen, 'Ausgrabungen im Theater von Magnesia am Maiandros', *Ath. Mitt.* 19 (1894), 1–53, at 25 (Magnesia ad Maeandrum) [= O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin 1900, 120–1, no. 152].

³³ *Tac. Ann.* 3.76 ['Cassius and Brutus were outshining everybody, for the very reason that their likenesses were not on view'].

³⁴ *Vell.* 2.69.5.

³⁵ *Epp. ad M. Brutum* 1.17.4: *quid inter Salvidienum et eum interest?* ['What difference is there between Salvidienus and him?'].

Virgil's First Patron

[1] The evidence about the life and experiences of Virgil in the years 42–39 BC is detailed and abundant. A disquieting phenomenon. The assertions of the biographers and commentators are usually bold and explicit, not seldom inconsistent. Allegory perpetrates the worst excesses, as when scholiasts speculate about the mysterious and possibly apocalyptic infant of the fourth *Eclogue*. Yet, allegory apart, no fact or name of known history seems able to curb the luxuriance of their evil imagining.

The *Vita* of Donatus derives from Suetonius, but it is not all Suetonius. The knowledge of Virgil possessed by the commentator Servius is warmly acclaimed by his friend Macrobius;¹ but Servius does not differ in kind and quality from such later compilers as the false Probus or the authors of the *Scholia Bernensia*. The weakness of his judgement is betrayed by certain comments on passages of historical reference in the *Aeneid*;² the paucity of his information completely annuls his interpretation of the *Eclogues*. The fourth *Eclogue* shows him up. Servius knows nothing at all about such material facts as the Pact of Brundisium, the marriage of [2] Antonius and Octavia, the relationship in time between Pollio's consulate and Pollio's triumph, the province he governed and the tribe he conquered. Instead, hariolations about the Dalmatian city of Salonae and Pollio's son Saloninus, who, he avers, smiled at birth and conveniently passed away within forty days, having already acquired a *cognomen*.³

This being so, how shall one discover from such sources the truth about the confiscations of landed property in northern Italy and the vicissitudes of Virgil's estate in the territory of Mantua?

Authentic details, it can happen, are transmitted after the lapse of centuries by feeble and trivial sources. Valuable and personal evidence was still available in the fifty years after Virgil's death—if men cared to use it. The poet's friend L. Varius Rufus related certain matters.⁴ Then there was Asconius Pedianus, a

[1] ¹ Macrobius, *Sat.* 6.6.1.

² Serv. in *Aen.* 1.286; 6.789; 6.842; 8.657–728; cf. [RE s. 2, II A 2, col. 1841–3].

³ [Ecl. 4.1.] ⁴ Quint. 6.3.78.

man from Patavium. According to the *Vita* of Donatus, Asconius acquired information about the relations between Virgil and the woman Plotia Hieria;⁵ he was also told, it is affirmed, something about the fourth *Eclogue* by Gallus, the son of Pollio.⁶ Asconius was a careful scholar, never afraid to confess the limits of his knowledge.⁷ Little of his material and nothing of his method seems to have percolated to Servius and his kin. On the contrary, idle fancies, childish confusions—and sheer fiction. For example, the Bern *Scholia* assert that Asconius had heard a certain [3] matter from the lips of Virgil, which is impossible.⁸ Further, a pair of discordant stories tell of the activities of that enigmatic character, Octavius Musa, in the rôle of a minor official at the time of the confiscations. If Servius is to be believed, he was incensed with the people of Mantua because they had impounded his cattle.⁹ The *Scholia Bernensia* are richer: Musa, a magistrate of Mantua, shut up the cattle of Varus in the forum and starved them to death, hence the anger of Varus against Mantua, but of course he spared Virgil's farm, for they were school-fellows.¹⁰ Again, the sources know the name of a soldier or centurion who threatened the life of the poet: he was called Clodius or Arrius—or Milienus Toro.¹¹

Invention of names, facts, and even documents may be assumed. The *Historia Augusta*, which, in its present form, dates from the generation of Servius, is an instructive and damaging parallel. Indeed, the author may well have been an erratic schoolmaster with a keen eye for the literary market. He delights in fabricating documents, speeches, and proper names, in creating specious etymologies. *Milienus Toro* would surely have evoked his approval or envy. His deduction from the name *Saloninus* puts him on a level with Servius.¹² The *Historia Augusta* states that Saloninus, the son of the Emperor Gallienus, was born at the Dalmatian city of Salonae, thence the name: the author forgot that the boy's mother was called Salonina.¹³

[4] Of the value of precise statements made by the scholiasts, little doubt should subsist, especially if they be read continuously, in their own context, and not in the selections commonly provided by handbooks and commentaries.¹⁴

⁵ Donatus 10. ⁶ [Serv. Auct. *Ecl.* 4.11.]

⁷ Asc. 10.19–22 (the mother-in-law of L. Piso).

⁸ Schol. Bern. in *Ecl.* 3.105.

⁹ Serv. *Ecl.* 9.7. Accepted by Schanz II, 35.

¹⁰ Schol. Bern. in *Ecl.* 8.6. *PIR* O 14 takes Musa as a *condiscipulus* of Virgil.

¹¹ Arrius: Donatus 63; [Serv. *Ecl.* 1.47; 3.94]; Clodius: [Serv. Auct. *Ecl.* 9.1]; Milienus Toro: [Probus, ed. Thilo, III, p. 328]. The name Milienus is not otherwise attested. W. Kroll, 'Randmeberkungen', *RhM* 64 (1909), 50–6, at 52, followed by Münzer, *RE* XV, 1664, state that the correct form is Millienus. How do they know?

¹² [*HA Gall.* 19.2–3.]

¹³ E.g. Schanz-Hosius II, 34–5 quotes only a part of Servius on *Ecl.* 6.6, omitting the revealing confusion between Alfenus Varus and P. Quinctilius Varus (*cos.* 13 BC), cf. below, n. [55].

¹⁴ Cf. esp. F. Leo, 'Vergils erste und neunte Eclogé', *Hermes* 38 (1903), 1–18 [= *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, ed. E. Fraenkel (Rome 1960) II, 1, 1–28]; W. Kroll, 'Randmeberkungen', *RhM* 64

The truth has been told before now, and forcibly.¹⁵ None the less, 'evidence' of this kind continues to be employed to illustrate the political events of the period, the history of Mantua and Cremona, on the biography and habits of contemporaries of the poet, such as C. Cornelius Gallus and P. Alfenus Varus;¹⁶ and elaborate reconstructions are based upon it, especially in the matter of the fourth *Eclogue* and the expropriations in Italy after the Battle of Philippi.¹⁷

'Tradition' is thereby vindicated, and the sum of knowledge acquires a specious augmentation: in truth, both the history of the time and the interpretation of the *Eclogues* are vitiated. The biographers and scholiasts were ignorant of the precise occasion when Virgil's estate was in danger; their allegations are inconsistent; they had nothing to go upon but inferences from *Ecl.* 1 and *Ecl.* 9. These poems are in any case far from easy to interpret—they baffle the flat and literal methods of the scholiasts.¹⁸

Ecl. 9, presumably the earlier in date, is the closer to reality of scenery and incident: a certain Menalcas tried by his poems to save from confiscation a stretch of land, 'from the last slope of the hills down to the [5] water'.¹⁹ Vainly, it appears; and an appeal in verse from Varus on behalf of Mantua is there quoted (see below, n. 27). This is usually taken as a precise allusion to the loss of Virgil's farm. Yet, though the poetical Menalcas may here, as elsewhere, be identified as Virgil, it does not follow beyond doubt from *Ecl.* 9 that Virgil's own property is referred to—only Virgil's property. The poet speaks for Mantua, not merely for himself.²⁰

In *Ecl.* 1 the allegory is subtle and elusive. Tityrus, the old man, an ex-slave whose farm has been preserved, is not actually P. Vergilius Maro, a landowner of Mantua;²¹ and the poem is intended to express much more than Virgil's personal gratitude to the young Caesar.

Extreme caution is therefore prescribed. The only sound method is to examine the historical background separately before using the one to elucidate the other. If in the process the scholiasts are allowed to intrude, good evidence

(1909), 50–6, at 50–5; E. Norden, 'Orpheus und Eurydice. Ein nachträgliches Gedenkblatt für Vergil', *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akad., phil.-hist. Klasse* (1934), 626–83 [= *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin 1966) 468–532].

¹⁵ E.g. A. Stein, on Cornelius Gallus (*RE* IV, 1343), accepts the allegation that Gallus was a *condiscipulus* of Virgil; and that in the War of Mutina, Cremona had taken sides with Antonius. In Schanz-Hosius I, 576 Alfenus Varus is a legate of Octavianus in 41 BC, in II, 33 governor of Gallia Cisalpina after Pollio in 40 BC.

¹⁶ J. Carcopino, *Virgile et le mystère de la IV^e Églogue* (Paris 1930); J. Bayet, 'Virgile et les triumvirs «agris dividundis»', *REL* 6 (1928), 271–99 [= *Mélanges de littérature latine* (Rome 1967) 169–98]; T. Frank, *Virgil. A Biography* (New York 1922) 3–14, 122–31.

¹⁷ [J. Carcopino, *Virgile et le mystère de la IV^e Églogue* (Paris 1930)].

¹⁸ Cf. F. Leo, 'Vergils erste und neunte Ekloge', *Hermes* 38 (1903), 1–18 [= *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* (Rome 1960) 2.11–28].

¹⁹ *Ecl.* 9.7–10.

²⁰ Cf. Kroll, 'Randbemerkungen', 51.

²¹ Cf. Leo, 'Ekloge', 9.

is wasted and contaminated with the bad. Nor is 'tradition' saved and justified. To accept any one 'traditional' detail usually involves the rejection of several other alternative guesses. Facts may well happen to be transmitted by the scholiasts; and, for all that can be known, some of their guesses may be plausible, even correct. Yet accidental veracity is not a virtue.

[6] The scholiasts are capable of asserting that anybody, from young Octavianus to the mature P. Alfenus Varus, whatever the disparity of age, was a *condiscipulus* of Virgil. It is likely enough that some of the persons mentioned in the *Eclogues* heard the lessons of the same grammarian or attended the lectures of the same philosopher—especially if he happened to be of the Epicurean persuasion.²² Who shall tell? When the scholiasts are confronted with authentic evidence, they are seen to be deplorable. Their unsupported testimony is a hazard—and a menace.

The *Eclogues* open with a poem in honour of Octavianus. Yet the most prominent person in the whole collection is not the young Caesar but C. Asinius Pollio (*cos.* 40 BC). The fourth Eclogue bears as its date and occasion the consulate of Pollio; he is also mentioned in the third; and the eighth is dedicated to him, though not by name, and alludes to his triumph (39 BC). As independent sources record precise and unimpeachable details about his activities and his allegiance in the years 41–39 BC, Pollio is paramount for the interpretation of Virgil's pastoral poem, in matter far transcending mere chronology.²³

The *Vitae* and the scholiasts import confusion and error. Common to most accounts is the notion that Virgil wrote the *Eclogues* as a thanksgiving for three persons, Pollio, Cornelius Gallus, and Alfenus Varus, for their exertions [6] in rescuing the paternal estate in the territory of Mantua; and these three men are described as *triumviri agris diuidendis*.²⁴ No need to add that the testimony of the 'authorities' is circumstantial—and discordant. Which has not been enough to deter the good will of harmonising critics. Hence various reconstructions, among them the theory that a board of land commissioners operated in rotation, Pollio, Varus, and Gallus year by year, in the triennium 41–39 BC.²⁵

The theory, like others, saves some of the 'evidence', reconciles some of the contradictions—and ignores the crux of the matter. The office and the activity attributed to Pollio, Gallus, and Varus are nothing more than an inference

²² Cf. the valuable evidence of the Philodemus fragment, A. Körte, 'Augusteer bei Philodem', *RhM* 45 (1890), 172–7. It mentions a Quintilianus and a Varius. (For Varius cf. also Quintilian 6.3.78.)

[2] ²³ Cf. H. Bennett, 'Virgil and Pollio', *AJP* 51 (1930), 325–42; Schanz II, 35 says: 'manches Eigenartige gibt H. Bennett'.

²⁴ E.g. Donatus 63.

²⁵ Cf. J. Bayet, 'Virgile et les triumvirs «agris dividundis»', *REL* 6 (1928) 271–99 [= *Mélanges de littérature latine* (Rome 1967) 169–98].

from their prominence in the *Eclogues*. In fact, these men are the only historical characters there mentioned by name as standing in a direct and personal relation to the poet.

So far so good. If the *Eclogues* put Pollio, Gallus, and Varus on a level, thanking and extolling them severally for similar reasons, there might be some support for the view held and perpetuated by the ancient commentators. But the poems do nothing of the kind. The consulate of Pollio is celebrated and, by anticipation, his triumph. Gallus appears also as a poet and lover. Not a word to show that either Pollio or Gallus had anything to do with the seizure and allocation of landed property.

[7] The case of Varus is different. In the ninth *Eclogue* it is stated that a pastoral character called Menalcas has interceded, apparently in vain,²⁶ and a fragment of one of his poems, promising Varus immortality of fame, should Mantua be preserved, is there quoted:

Vare, tuum nomen, superet modo Mantua nobis,
Mantua vae miserae nimium vicina Cremonae,
cantantes sublime ferent ad sidera cycni.²⁷

The dedication of the sixth *Eclogue* furnishes further information about Varus. The poet assigns him military repute and, while acknowledging his patronage, gently declines to sing his praises in epic verse:

Nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt, qui dicere laudes,
Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)
agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam.
non iniussa cano. si quis tamen haec quoque, si quis
captus amore leget, te nostrae, Vare, myricae,
te nemus omne canet; nec Phoebus gratior ulla est
quam sibi quae Vari praescipsit pagina nomen.²⁸

This passage may represent Virgil's thanksgiving on behalf of Mantua—but it does not say so in so many words.

Be that as it may; *Ecl.* 9 shows that one (but only one) of the alleged *tresuiri* is concerned with the vicissitudes of real estate in Gallia Cisalpina. Before inferences from the *Eclogues* can be admitted [9] the independent

²⁶ *Ecl.* 9.10.

²⁷ *Ecl.* 9.27–29 ['Varus, let but Mantua be spared us—Mantua, alas, too close to ill-fated Cremona—singing swans shall bear your name aloft to the stars', trans. H. R. Fairclough, modified].

²⁸ *Ecl.* 6.6–12 ['And now, for enough, and more, you will find eager to sing your praises, Varus, and build the story of grim war—now will I woo the rustic Muse on slender reed. I am not singing unbidden strains. Still, if any there be to read even these my lays—any whom love of the theme has won, it is of you Varus, our tamarisk shall sing, of thee all our groves. To Phoebus no page is more welcome that which bears on its front the name of Varus', trans. H. R. Fairclough, modified].

historical evidence must be sifted and set in order. How and where do Pollio, Gallus, and Varus come in?

The position of Pollio is clear in fact, but not in law. He held Gallia Cisalpina for Antonius with an army of seven legions in 41 BC—perhaps since 42 BC. Nothing shows his presence at the Battle of Philippi. A person of strong character and Republican sentiments, Pollio may have extorted from Antonius a command that avoided the grim necessity of *impia arma*.²⁹ on a later occasion, alone of all senators, he refused to participate in the War of Actium.

Since the grant of full citizenship to the communities of Transpadana in 49 BC, the Cisalpine province had been an anomaly. After Philippi the Triumvirs decided to abolish it.³⁰ For one reason or another, the decision was not at once put into effect. Pollio, proconsul or legate of Antonius, retained his command: in the spring or summer of 41 BC he did his best to stop Octavianus' general, Salvidienus, from conducting troops through his area on the way to Spain.³¹

The confiscations in Italy produced a clash of competence—or a trial of strength. Before the campaign of Philippi the Triumvirs had marked down the territories of eighteen of the most wealthy cities of Italy;³² and after the victory of the Caesarian party it was Octavianus' task to super[10]intend the seizure of land for the veterans while Antonius raised money in the East. Such operations were usually conducted by local commissioners. Thus in 45 BC, Q. Valerius Orca was active in northern Etruria, with the rank of propraetor: Cicero besought him to spare the estate of an impoverished senator.³³ In 41 BC, the ex-consul L. Munatius Plancus settled military colonists at Beneventum.³⁴ Powers and competence might vary, it is true; and the position might be different in a province. Of Cluvius, attested in the Cisalpina in 45 BC, it is stated that he had been entrusted with *negotium*, not *iudicium*.³⁵ he was certainly a commissioner, not a proconsul.³⁶

It had been intended, however, that in 41 BC Cisalpine Gaul should be treated as a part of Italy. There were precedents. Pompeius as consul in 55 BC had levied recruits from Cisalpina;³⁷ and the military oath of allegiance in 52 BC covered that region.³⁸ On this occasion, a list of the wealthiest cities of Italy could not have omitted certain of the flourishing communities of the North—Patavium in the first instance.³⁹ The abolition of the Cisalpine province may therefore have been decreed, not to prevent the maintenance of

²⁹ Cf. Caesar's treatment of D. Brutus.

³⁰ Cass. Dio 48.12.5; cf. Appian [BC 5.3].

³¹ App. BC 5.3.

³² App. BC 5.31.

³³ Cic. Fam. 13.5.

³⁴ ILS 881. Note L. Memmius, ILS 887.

³⁵ Cic. Fam. 13.7.1 on (C.?) Cluvius; many difficulties, cf. RE IV, 120.

³⁶ In March, 45 BC, C. Vibius Pansa took the place of Brutus as proconsul, Att. 12.19.3; 27.3.

³⁷ Caes. BG 6.1.

³⁸ Caes. BG 7.1.

³⁹ No Cisalpine cities are mentioned by Appian. But cf. the wealth of Patavium. Patavium for the Senate in 43 BC: Cic. Phil. 12.10.

armies in Italy, as has been alleged or believed,⁴⁰ but to impose, justify, and facilitate 'uniformity of sacrifice'.

Under the Triumvirs, mere law mattered little at any time. In 41 BC Italy was soon in confusion, heralding open war. L. Antonius and Fulvia, [11] opposing Octavianus, took up the cause of the propertied classes; Pollio sent them troops and money.⁴¹ Whatever agents may have been operating, or trying to operate, in the North, whatever his own power and competence before the law, Pollio was *de facto* in a position to safeguard his friends and clients—and to penalise the recalcitrant. He retained control of the Cisalpina through the Perusine War until early summer of 40 BC. It happens to be recorded that Pollio exacted severe contributions in money from the city of Patavium.⁴² That does not mean, however, that Pollio should be regarded merely as an agrarian and fiscal commissioner, still less as member of a board.

Gallus and Varus now remain to be discussed. The earliest contemporary reference to C. Cornelius Gallus, a Roman knight from Forum Julii in Gallia Narbonensis, occurs in a letter written by Pollio in June, 43 BC: he is designated as *familiaris meus*, and commended to Cicero.⁴³ Gallus had in his possession the text of a historical drama that had recently been put on the stage at Gades; he had therefore been in Hispania Ulterior with Pollio, the governor of that province. Apart from that, there is no definite evidence about his whereabouts or activities until he emerges as a general under Octavianus in the invasion of Egypt (30 BC). Gallus may have been in the Cisalpina when Pollio governed that province, perhaps with the rank of [12] equestrian chief of staff, *praefectus fabrum*.⁴⁴ The post was important, held by knights of some rôle and consequence—compare Balbus and Mamurra with Caesar.⁴⁵ A conjecture, nothing more—but based upon the known and regular practice of patronage in Roman administration; as such, therefore, surely preferable to the supposition that a Roman knight was an equipollent colleague of the eminent personage designated to be consul in 40 BC. But the conjecture is not necessary. Nothing in the *Eclogue* shows that Gallus was in northern Italy in these years—the circumstantial allegations of the Virgilian scholiasts must not be allowed to intrude.⁴⁶ The fact to be retained is the attested relation of friendship between Gallus and the Antonian Pollio.

⁴⁰ Cass. Dio 48.12.5. That would not prevent troops in Italy.

⁴¹ Cass. Dio 48.12.5. ⁴² Macrob. *Sat.* 1.11.22.

⁴³ Cic. *Fam.* 10.32.

⁴⁴ RR 252 n. 4.

⁴⁵ RR 355.

⁴⁶ Serv. on *Ecl.* 6.64 says that Gallus was appointed to exact money from such Transpadane communities as had not been divided up. Note Serv. on *Ecl.* 9.10: *ex oratione Cornelii in Alfenum ostenditur cum iussus tria milia passus a muro in diversa relinquere, vix octingentos passus aquae, quae circumdata est, admetireris, reliquisti* ['when you were assigning land, having been ordered to leave three miles in every direction from the wall, you scarcely left 800 paces of water which lie around it', trans. L. P. Wilkinson] (*Schanz* II, 35). Accepted by Kroll ('Randbemerkungen', *RhM* 64 [1909] 52) as 'ein Goldkorn'. Note Quint. 1.5.8 refer to an *oratio Labieni sive illa Cornelii Galli est in Pollionem*.

Both the adequate information about Pollio at this time and the complete absence of evidence about Gallus may be said to facilitate the enquiry. Varus is a cause of perturbation. First, his identity. There are two claimants, Alfenus Varus and Quintilius Varus. By an unhappy coincidence, both are said to come from the same town, Cremona; and one, perhaps both, had affinities with the sect of the Epicureans.

It will be advisable to set forth briefly the evidence about Quintilius Varus, in descending order of validity. In one of his odes [13] Horace bewails the death of Quintilius, a friend of Virgil;⁴⁷ and in the *Ars Poetica* he speaks of Quintilius as a literary critic.⁴⁸ The famous papyrus fragment of Philodemus mentions along with Virgil and two other friends a certain Quintilius;⁴⁹ he is therefore a palpable Epicurean. So far the contemporary evidence. Jerome states that Quintilius, the friend of Horace and Virgil, came from Cremona.⁵⁰ What, however, is the authority for the *cognomen* 'Varus'? It occurs only in the latest and weakest testimonies. Servius mentions Quintilius Varus, alleging that he was a relative of Virgil;⁵¹ and the Horatian scholiast Porphyrio speaks of *Quintilius Varus Cremonensis amicus Vergilii, eques Romanus*.⁵² That is to say, the justification for the *cognomen* is slight. Confusion with Alfenus Varus is not to be excluded—a cause or a result of it may also be the assertion of Jerome or Porphyrio that Quintilius Varus was a man of Cremona; Porphyrio makes the same statement about Alfenus Varus (see [below, p. 221]).

For the scholiast it would be a sore temptation, conscious or unconscious, to attach the *cognomen* 'Varus' to a Quintilius. They knew about the Roman general who lost three legions in Germany, P. Quintilius Varus (*cos.* 13 BC), as they show in a fashion not altogether to their credit. Servius in *Ecl.* 6 is revealing. The Varus there alluded to, he says, conquered the Germans, gaining much gold and glory; other identify him [14] with the ill-fated Varus; other again with Alfenus Varus, legate of the Transpadana and land commissioner.⁵³

The fact that Quintilius Varus was indubitably a friend of Virgil and an Epicurean has induced some modern scholars to claim him for the Varus of the *Eclogues*, spurning Alfenus.⁵⁴ Yet only Servius and Porphyrio assign to Quintilius the *cognomen* 'Varus'. Caution is indicated.⁵⁵ Moreover, Quintilius does not seem to have been a figure of political importance—which is strictly relevant, given Virgil's language about Varus in *Ecl.* 6 and *Ecl.* 9.

⁴⁷ Hor. *Carm.* 1.24. ⁴⁸ *Ars Poetica* 3.438.

⁴⁹ A. Körte, 'Augusteer bei Philodem', *RhM* 45 (1890), 176–7.

⁵⁰ Jerome, *Chron. Euseb.*, Olymp. 189.1, 24 BC [p. 165 H.].

⁵¹ Servius on *Ecl.* 5.20. ⁵² Porph. on AP 438. ⁵³ Servius on *Ecl.* 6.6.

[3] ⁵⁴ E.g. T. Frank, 'Vergil's Apprenticeship. II', *CP* 15 (1920), 103–19, at 114.

⁵⁵ In any case, among people claiming the *cognomen* Varus the only certain Epicurean friend of Virgil is Quintilius, as the papyrus shows.

The *Vitae* and the scholiasts identify the Varus of the *Eclogues* as Alfenus Varus, that is, P. Alfenus Varus (*cos. suff.* 39 BC). In *Ecl.* 6 Virgil alludes to Varus' exploits in war—*tristia condere bella*.⁵⁶ Now P. Alfenus Varus was a jurist of some note. But it needed more than law or oratory to bring a man to the fore in the revolutionary age. Whatever the legal accomplishments of Alfenus, they cannot have earned him the consulate.⁵⁷ *Tristia bella* indicates civil war. It follows that he was an active partisan of the Triumvirs, promoted because of the *militaris industria*, for such was the phrase: how high, or how long, P. Alfenus Varus ranked socially among the *novi homines* of the day cannot precisely be ascertained; but the form of his family name is significant.

In the ninth *Eclogue* Virgil invokes Varus on behalf of Mantua.⁵⁸ [14] Moreover, the dedication of the sixth *Eclogue* uses words that befit a poet addressing a patron or benefactor—*non iniussa cano*. The language of Virgil indicates that Varus was an important personage. The traditional identification may therefore be regarded as a reasonable inference: in fact, it does not need the support of the commentators. The Varus of the *Eclogue* is the consul P. Alfenus Varus, a jurist, a military man, a Caesarian partisan—and a parvenu.

Little else is known. Hence room for speculation. First, his intellectual affiliations. It has been suggested that he was an Epicurean. Apart from the scholiasts,⁵⁹ the evidence is dual. A juristic fragment quoted by the *Digest* shows acquaintance with the teaching of Epicurus;⁶⁰ but this may be an interpolation.⁶¹ Nor is the evidence of the sixth *Eclogue* unequivocal. It has been argued that the subject matter of the poem is strongly Epicurean, and that contention has been widely and uncritically accepted. It is not at all plausible.⁶² Furthermore, the fact that a poem which mentions Gallus (*Ecl.* 6.64) is dedicated to somebody else may seem strange.⁶³ perhaps the dedication to Varus, which can easily be dissociated from the context, like the lines to the address of Pollio in *Ecl.* 8.6–13 (see [below, p. 224]), a subsequent insertion. All is uncertain, and it matters very little. The doctrines of Epicurus enjoyed a wide popularity among the contemporaries of Virgil. They are no [16] criterion.

Secondly, the origin of Alfenus Varus. He is the first consul whose *gentilicium* ends in *-enus*; a flagrant mark of the non-Latin derivation of his family.⁶⁴ The termination indicates Etruria or the regions once subject to Etruscan influences, especially Umbria and the north Sabine lands; but may be found

⁵⁶ *Ecl.* 6.6, 10, 12.

⁵⁷ *RR* 245 n. 4.

⁵⁸ *Ecl.* 9.26–9.

⁵⁹ *Serv. Ecl.* 6.9, 6.13; *Schol. Ver. Ecl.* 7.9.

⁶⁰ *Dig.* 5.1.76.

⁶¹ Cf. A. Momigliano, 'Epicureans in Revolt', *JRS* 31 (1941), 149–57, at 155 [= *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Rome 1960) 375–88, at 384–5].

⁶² Cf. G. Jachmann, 'Vergils sechste Eclogie', *Hermes* 58 (1923), 288–304, esp. 290.

⁶³ Kroll, *RhM* 64 (1909), 54 n. 2: 'rätselhafte Verkoppelung seines Lobes mit dem des Varus in E. 6, die auch für uns unerklärbar ist'. So also Schanz II, 48: 'auffallend'.

⁶⁴ *RR* 93 n. 4.

elsewhere, carried by immigrants and furnishing a sure proof of immigration. About this Alfenus, the scholiast on Horace brings startling and scandalous news. Making mock of the paradox that the wise man is universally competent, Horace puts wilfully deceptive arguments into the mouths of the Stoics—Hermogenes though silent is yet a singer, Alfenus was a cobbler even when he had closed his shop and thrown away his tools:

ut quamvis tacet Hermogenes, cantor tamen atque
optimus est modulator; ut Alfenus vafer omni
abiecto instrumento artis clausaque taberna
sutor erat.⁶⁵

Porphyrio is explicit: Alfenus Varus, shoemaker of Cremona, gave up his practice and went to Rome, learned the law as a pupil of Ser. Sulpicius Rufus and acquired great eminence as jurist, the consulate, and a public funeral.⁶⁶ What shall be made of all this? Facts often blend with fiction in the scholiasts. Alfenus the jurist was certainly a disciple of Ser. Sulpicius Rufus.⁶⁷ Further, it was common to allege that *novi homines* had risen from obscure [17] origins and disgusting professions. Many a municipal aristocrat of ancient and reputable stock was thus traduced. If Porphyrio is right, if by Alfenus the cobbler Horace means Alfenus the jurist and consul, the allegation might be toned down to credibility—Alfenus owned a shoe factory.⁶⁸

But it is far from certain that Porphyrio is recording an authentic detail. Nor did Horace in his *Satires* enjoy the privileged licence of Lucilius. Times had changed. In the Rome of the Triumvirs a freedman's son knew better than to make jokes about leading personages of the Caesarian military oligarchy. It is all very well for Porphyrio to assert that Horace's ridicule is polite—*urbane Alfenum Varum Cremonensem deridet* [in Hor. Sat. 1.3.130]. Nothing can support the assumption that *novi homines* relish being called cobblers, least of all such as have made money from factories. If Horace took it upon himself thus to deride an eminent consular, his action stands in flagrant contrast to the whole tone and character of his *Satires*.

P. Alfenus P. f. Varus (*cos. suff.* 39 BC) will not be identified with a Horatian cobbler. Did he in fact come from Cremona? A consul with such an origin might at first seem surprising. Cremona, however, though it lies on the northern bank of the Po, does not belong to the communities of the Transpadana—it was a Latin colony, founded in 218 BC. The consuls created by the Triumvirs are a motley company.⁶⁹ Alfenus was not the worst. Only a

⁶⁵ Hor. Sat. 1.3.129–33 ['Hermogenes is still the best of singers and musicians, even when he is silent; as shrewd Alfenus, after throwing away every tool of his art and closing down his shop, was a cobbler', trans. H. R. Fairclough, modified].

⁶⁶ Porph. on Sat. 1.3.130. Note Porph. on Rupilius Rex, cf. RE IA, 1231–2!

⁶⁷ Dig. 1.2.2.44.

⁶⁸ So Klebs, RE I, 1472.

⁶⁹ Syme, RR 188–9, 199–201, 244.

few [18] months earlier the *fascēs* were held by Balbus from Gades, neither an Italian by blood nor a citizen by birth; and Alfenus himself may have inherited the consulship to which had been designated the unspeakable Salvidienus, of lowly origin and significant nomenclature.

Catullus the poet from Verona had a friend called Alfenus.⁷⁰ He may, or may not, be the same person as the Varus addressed in one poem and mentioned in another:⁷¹ there is no means of telling. Nothing excludes a North-Italian origin for P. Alfenus Varus. Porphyrio may be right about Cremona.

Third and last, the political allegiance of Alfenus. Of which of the Caesarian leaders was he an adherent? Unequivocal and independent evidence is absent.⁷² The consular *Fasti* may help. Of the Triumvir's consuls in the years 40–37 BC all except Varus and the mysterious L. Cornelius (*cos. suff.* 38 BC) can be assigned either to Octavianus or Antonius: excluding these two, they number thirteen. As for the Triumvir Lepidus, who was given Africa after the Pact of Brundisium, none of these consuls belonged to his following: he appears to have lacked important adherents. None the less, he was not totally devoid of political influence. There is therefore a chance that Alfenus was one of his partisans.⁷³

The *Fasti* indicate that for a time the balance was maintained between Octavianus' men and Antonius' in the apportionment of rewards and [19] patronage. In 40 BC Pollio and Calvinus were succeeded by Canidius and Balbus: and the *ordinarii* of the next year were Censorinus and Calvisius, Antonian and Caesarian respectively. The *suffecti* were Alfenus and C. Cocceius Balbus. The latter was an Antonian.⁷⁴ Alfenus might therefore be a partisan of the young Caesar. But this is not a safe inference. It is necessary to examine the years following. Of the four consuls of 38 BC, three are Caesarian, the other not definable (L. Cornelius). If the years 40–37 BC be taken as a whole, it appears that, of the thirteen consuls of attested allegiance, eight belong to Octavianus, only five to Antonius. The proportion of Caesarians seems excessive. Marcus Antonius got the credit (with the contemporaries at least) for the victory of Philippi and though the War of Perusia had impaired his prestige, he was still the predominant leader in the Caesarian party. The proportion of Antonian consuls should therefore not be as low as five against eight, still less five against nine or ten. The five leaders come nearer equality if Alfenus, and L. Cornelius as well, are regarded as Antonians.

⁷⁰ Cat. 30.1.

⁷¹ 22.1; 10.1. No evidence about the Varus of Horace, *Carm.* 1.18 (NB: Pompeius Varus).

⁷² RR 235 n. 8: 'allegiance not recorded' [the exact quote reads: 'The political affiliations of this mysterious character are not unequivocally recorded'].

⁷³ Cf. CIL 8.979 (Curubi), [P.] Al[fenu]s P. f. Vaarus leg. pr. [?] Usually attributed to his son, as RE I, 1474.

⁷⁴ RR 200, 267.

If P. Alfenus Varus was an adherent of Antonius, what were his position and services? A guess could be hazarded. Pollio held the Cisalpina for Antonius in 41–40 BC; Pollio's friend, Cornelius Gallus, may have served on his staff; the last of the three personages prominent in the *Eclogues* of Virgil, Varus, may have been a legate of Pollio. An interesting collection—but only a speculation. Yet, at that, surely more plausible than the supposition that Pollio, Varus, and Gallus were land commissioners, whether simultaneous or rotatory. As has been demonstrated, the rank and function of Pollio in Gallia Cisalpina cannot so be circumscribed.

[20] But Alfenus Varus may have owed allegiance to the young Caesar. Perhaps he was one of the generals who, after the fiasco of the *Bellum Perusinum*, expelled Asinius Pollio from northern Italy in the summer of 40 BC. He may then have held that region for Octavianus, departing for a well-earned consulate in the second half of the following year. That is, not a mere land commissioner. This interpretation could be supported by the passages in Servius.⁷⁵ Though the commentators serve up many deplorable—and inconsistent—scraps of guesswork, they may transmit authentic details, derived ultimately from persons in a position to know. Few of the great *novi homines* of the period were able to perpetuate their dignity or even their family.⁷⁶ Alfenus, however, like Pollio, had a consular son, P. Alfenus Varus (*cos.* AD 2). Hence a possibility that information permeated to Asconius. Such revelations, however, were not always disinterested—compare what Pollio's son Gallus told the scholarly Patavine. Nor is every appeal to Asconius genuine. Speculation is therefore to be deprecated.

On any count, the *Eclogues* present Varus as a friend of Virgil, a military man and a figure of some consequence. That is certain. All else about him is doubtful. What inferences can be made about the fate of Virgil's farm and the dating of the *Eclogues*? Few, and singularly fragile.

No historian preserves any record of the activities of this enigmatic character; but the *Fasti* establish the importance of P. Alfenus Varus. As has been indicated, he may have served as a legate of the Antonian Pollio; or he may have held the Cisalpina for Octavianus after the enforced retirement of Pollio in 40 BC. Yet nothing in the *Eclogues* compels the assumption that Varus was in northern Italy. Were he elsewhere, his patronage could still have been invoked on behalf of Virgil, especially if, like the poet, he belonged to the North. If his origin from Cremona be accepted, Virgil's [21] language in the appeal to Varus acquired added poignancy—

⁷⁵ Serv. on *Ecl.* 6.6, referred to above, n. 53; on *Ecl.* 9.27: *sane blanditur Alfeno Varo, qui, Pollione fugato, legatus Transpadanis praepositus est ab Augusto*. Accepted by the moderns, e.g. Schanz-Hosius II, 34–5.

⁷⁶ RR 498–9.

Mantua, vae, miserae nimium vicina Cremonae.⁷⁷

But this is uncertain. Nor does any independent evidence put Cornelius Gallus, the second of the ostensible land commissioners, into relation with the Cisalpina.⁷⁸ Complete obscurity envelops Gallus from 43 to 30 BC. Only Pollio remains for guidance.

Furthermore, nothing shows that the poet was residing in the territory of Mantua at the time of the confiscations, unless any cling to fables about hazardous encounters with brutal centurions. Nor again does the attested friendship of Virgil with Pollio, Varus, and Gallus have to be explained by the hypothesis of their simultaneous presence in Cisalpina. Previous acquaintance, begotten or nourished by common tastes and common studies, is not unlikely—at least for Pollio and for Gallus, though the evidence is unsafe. In the case of Pollio, no fact or guess happens to stand on record. The Cisalpine poet C. Helvius Cinna, mentioned in the *Eclogues*,⁷⁹ may have been an early link between them: he dedicated a poem to Pollio.⁸⁰ Gallus, to be sure, is alleged to have been a *condiscipulus* of Virgil;⁸¹ and ancient scholars established the age of Gallus by supposing him exactly contemporaneous, born in 70 BC (perhaps a few years too late).⁸² Alfenus Varus was older, perhaps born as early as 90 BC;⁸³ after his consulate nothing is known but his funeral. Alfenus Varus does not appear to have been an intimate friend of Virgil; his Epicurean affiliations, if proved, cannot prove much.

The scenery of the *Eclogues* has been often discussed, sometimes [22] invoked with undue confidence. One passage, *Ecl.* 8.6–13, is explicit: it purports to be written in northern Italy, in the expectation of Pollio's return from his province in 39 BC (see below, n. 93). Convincing evidence therefore about Virgil's conception of his pastoral world—but not about his actual whereabouts.⁸⁴ For a part of the time at least in 40 and 39 BC Campania was a safer residence than the North, a resort not remote from patrons and protectors, but offering access to the masters of Rome.

Inferences from the *Eclogues*, expanded—or diluted—by select infusions from biographers and scholiasts, are not enough to furnish a clear account of the status and title of Virgil's farm in the year after Philippi. It may well have been in danger more than once, as some have inferred, but without necessity, from *Ecl.* 1 and *Ecl.* 9. The political situation must be carefully examined.

⁷⁷ *Ecl.* 9.28 ['Mantua, alas, too close to ill-fated Cremona'].

⁷⁸ See above, n. 46.

⁷⁹ *Ecl.* 9.35–6: *nam neque adhuc Vario uideor nec dicere Cinna/digna.*

[4] ⁸⁰ Charisius, *GLK* 1.124.5. ⁸¹ Probus, *Ecl. praef.* p. 327.30.

⁸² Cf. R. Syme, *CQ* 32 (1938), 40 [= *RP* 1.48–9].

⁸³ Age of Alfenus: [no evidence survives for his date of birth. Syme's guess is probably as good as any: cf. the estimate of E. Otto, *Thesaurus Iuris Romani*, V (Utrecht 1735) 1637, who viewed Alfenus as a close contemporary of Catullus and placed his date of birth around 85 BC.]

⁸⁴ Likewise Tityrus' journey to Rome.

Whatever the operations of local commissars or minor agents in the Cisalpina—and such there presumably were—the arbitrament rested with Pollio. As long as Pollio was there, proconsul or legate of M. Antonius, it may be assumed that Virgil's lands enjoyed the protection of Virgil's patron. The War of Perusia brought trouble in its train; when Pollio was expelled by the generals of Octavianus in the summer of 40 BC, Virgil's title, if maintained by special favour and patronage, again became precarious. If Alfenus was an adherent of the young Caesar, his aid may now have been invoked, whether or not he was in charge of the Cisalpina: his influence need not have depended on his presence. However that may be, the Pact of Brundisium reconciled the rival dynasts—and Pollio, whose mediation had been signal and successful, was again, after the interval of a few months in a position to succour his friends. Either Pollio or Varus alone, [23] powerful persons each of them, could now have secured Virgil's title. Whatever their immediate services, one of the Triumvirs gained the enduring credit. Pollio soon departed to his province of Macedonia; and the first *Eclogue* gratefully acclaims the young Caesar.

It follows that next to nothing can be known about this episode in Virgil's life. Legends and fabrications discarded, what evidence remains for determining when the *Eclogues* were written and given to the world? The poems themselves provide only two clear dates—the invocation of Pollio as consul in *Ecl.* 4 and the dedication, hinting at Pollio's triumph in *Ecl.* 8.

Other evidence is inferior and delusive, being based on inferences and combinations. A modern handbook, it is true, states that the testimony of the ancients puts the composition of the *Eclogues* in the years 42–39 BC.⁸⁵ The 'testimony of the ancients' is by no means unequivocal. Servius says that Virgil wrote the poem when aged eight and twenty, i.e. in 42 BC;⁸⁶ another scholiast affirming that he published them then, invokes, with what warrant one cannot say, the respectable authority of Asconius Pedianus.⁸⁷ Hence 42 BC seems to indicate the termination, not the beginning, of the *Eclogues*.

Servius also repeats elsewhere the statement of the *Vita* of Donatus to the effect that the composition of the poems took three years.⁸⁸ Hence the modern combination, deriving from, yet not justified by, these pieces of 'evidence', that the *Eclogues* were begun in 42 and completed in 39 BC. What in fact is the *triennium* referred to by Donatus? His words are *Bucolica triennio, Georgica VIII, Aeneida XI perfecit annis*.⁸⁹ The total corresponds to the twenty-one years comprised between the two known dates, the consulate of Pollio and the death of Virgil, namely 40–19 BC. Donatus' *triennium* therefore is presumably 40–37 BC.

⁸⁵ Schanz-Hosius II, 37: 'nach Aussage alter Zeugnisse'.

⁸⁶ Servius on *Ecl.* p. 3.26 Thilo.

⁸⁷ Probus, *Ecl. praef.* 329.5.

⁸⁸ Servius on *Aen.* p. 2.8 Th.

⁸⁹ Donatus 25.

[24] Once again, no advantage accrues from twisting and combining 'authorities' feeble if not fraudulent. Instead, modest guesswork, admitted for what it is, might suggest that the *Eclogues* were composed between 43 and 38 BC. The collection as it stands offers many puzzles. Not a few scholars have invoked the hypothesis of two editions.⁹⁰ It might be so; detailed and convincing proof is another matter.

At the least, some of the poems may have been slightly modified before publication, so as to suit changed circumstances of personal or political allegiance. The existence of certain peculiarities and obscurities in the fourth *Eclogue* would thus be explained. If, as has been firmly argued,⁹¹ that poem commemorates the marriage of Antonius and the sister of Octavianus, the pledge and sign of the dynast's restored allegiance at Brundisium, some alterations were bound to be needed before long, if only because the match did not produce a son. Further, it is possible that the lines addressed to Varus in *Ecl.* 6 are a later insertion.⁹²

The clearest sign of a change of plan—and more than that—is furnished by the dedication to Pollio inserted in the eight *Eclogue*—

tu mihi, seu magni superas iam saxa Timaui
sive oram Illyrici legis aequoris,—en erit umquam
ille dies, mihi cum liceat tua dicere facta?
en erit ut liceat totum mihi ferre per orbem
sola Sophocleo tua carmina digna coturno?
a te principium; tibi desinet: accipe iussis
carmina coepta tuis, atque hanc sine tempora circum
inter vitricis hederam tibi serpere laurus.⁹³

[25] The person indicated is patently Pollio. The comments of Servius are inconsistent as well as imbecile. Discussing l. 6, he takes it to refer to Octavianus;⁹⁴ on l. 12, however, seeing that Pollio is meant, he says that the words were addressed to Pollio who was on his way to attack Salonae and, after that, to join Antonius in the eastern lands—*tunc Illyricum petebat, oppugnaturus*

⁹⁰ [See e.g. G. Sabbadini, 'La composizione della *Georgica* di Virgilio', *RFIC* 29 (1901), 16–22; J. Bayet, 'Les premières «Georgiques» de Virgile', *RPh* 56 (1930), 128–50, 227–47.]

⁹¹ Cf. W. W. Tarn, 'Alexander Helios and the Golden Age', *JRS* 22 (1932), 135–60, spec. 152–7.

⁹² Cf. above [p. 224].

⁹³ *Ecl.* 8.6–13 ['But you, my friend, whether even now you are passing the crags of the great Timavus, or skirting the coast of the Illyrian sea, will that day ever come when I shall be free to tell your deeds? Will I ever be free to spread through all the world those songs of yours, alone worthy of the buskin of Sophocles? From you is my beginning; in your honour I shall end. Accept the songs attempted in your bidding, and grant that about your brows this ivy may creep among the victor's laurels', trans. H. R. Fairclough, modified].

⁹⁴ Serv. *Ecl.* 8.6 [*ubi ubi es, o Auguste, sive Venetiae fluentia transcendis...*, 'where, where are you, Augustus, are you crossing over the rivers of the Venetia...'].

*Salonas et inde ad Orientem ad Antonium profecturus.*⁹⁵ This bold and circumstantial assertion is refuted by the language of the poem itself, which describes a journey up the Adriatic, not down the Adriatic. Virgil imagines Pollio returning to Italy from his province—he is already, *iam*, crossing the cliffs of the river Timavus at the head of the Adriatic or is still sailing along the coast of Dalmatia. Timavus is highly relevant to the return of a Roman general, C. Sempronius Tuditanus (*cos.* 129 BC), victorious over various Illyrian tribes, erected an altar or a temple there, with a dedication in Saturnian verses.⁹⁶

If this were not enough, the direction of the journey attributed to Pollio is confirmed by a later echo of the phrase. Virgil, telling how Antenor sailed to the Venetian land, mentions the crossing of the Timavus:

Antenor potuit mediis elapsus Achivis
Illyrios penetrare sinus atque intuma tutus
regna Liburnorum et fontem superare Timavi.⁹⁷

The dedication of *Ecl.* 8 presupposes Pollio's victory; and the laurels encircling the proconsul's brow prefigure his triumph, perhaps by a feigned anticipation of what had already happened. The geographical indication shows that the lines were written in northern Italy—rather, perhaps, from the point of view of a man from northern Italy.

[26] An approximate date emerges. Soon after the conclusion of the Pact of Brundisium (September 7, 40 BC) suffect consuls entered office at Rome; towards the end of the year, or early in 39 BC, Pollio was despatched across the sea by Antonius.⁹⁸ It was his task to deal with the Illyrian tribe of the Parthini, in the hinterland of Dyrrhachium.⁹⁹ Their transgressions do not appear to have been serious. But Pollio wanted a triumph, which no exploits in a civil war could give; perhaps also it was expedient that, like the other generals who had participated in the War of Perusia, he should be absent from Italy for a time. So Pollio earned easy laurels in the traditional fashion. The *Acta Triumphalia* provide the date of the triumph over the Parthini, October 25.¹⁰⁰ The year is missing. It is presumably 39 BC, for the historian Cassius Dio narrates the campaign against the Parthini under that year.¹⁰¹ Pollio's province was clearly Macedonia; as proconsul of that province he succeeded

⁹⁵ Serv. on *Ecl.* 8.12 ['he was then heading for the Illyricum, with a view to attacking Salona and then making his way to the East to meet Antony'].

⁹⁶ *ILS* 8885; cf. A. von Premerstein, 'Ein Elogium des C. Sempronius Tuditanus', *JAÖI* 10 (1907), 264–82; F. Bücheler, 'Saturnier des Tuditanus *cos.* 625/129', *RhM* 63 (1908), 321–8.

⁹⁷ *Aen.* 1.242–44 ['The Greeks were all around Antenor, but he escaped them, made his way safely into the Illyrian Gulf and the heartlands of the kingdom of the Liburnians, and then went beyond the mouth of the Timavus', trans. D. West].

⁹⁸ See Carcopino [*Le mystère*, 182–9]. ⁹⁹ Cass. Dio 48.41.7; cf. App. *BC* 5.75.

¹⁰⁰ *CIL* 1², p. 50.

¹⁰¹ Dio never antedates such campaigns.

another partisan of Antonius, namely L. Marcius Censorinus, who celebrated his triumph on January 1, 39 BC.¹⁰²

Pollio's triumph, held in the autumn of 39 BC, is anticipated or alluded to in the dedication of *Ecl.* 8. Though the meaning of the passage is clear, it demands further inspection. In the first place, the dedication bears no relation to the context: it may easily be an insertion. Secondly, it is surely the dedication, not of the poem, but of a whole collection—Virgil acclaim Pollio as the begetter of his inspiration, crown, and climax of his achievement—

a te principium, tibi desinet.

['From you is my beginning; in your honour I shall end.']

[27] Similarly, so Virgil affirms, the poems shall be dedicated to Pollio, for they were written at the request of Pollio—

accipe iussis
carmina coepta tuis.

[8.11: 'Receive the songs begun at your orders']

To be compared is the language which acknowledges the parentage of the *Georgics*—*tua, Maecenas, haud mollia iussa*.¹⁰³

The conclusion is this. The passage is nothing less than the original dedication of the *Eclogues*; and Pollio is Virgil's first patron. When the poems were published, however, Octavianus with *Ecl.* 1 has acquired title and priority. In that poem Tityrus renders thanks to the young Caesar for the preservation of his livelihood—

O Meliboe, deus nobis haec otia fecit.
namque erit ille mihi semper deus, illius aram
saepe tener nostris ab ovilibus imbuet agnus.
ille meas errare boves, ut cernis, et ipsum
ludere quae vellem calamo permisit agresti.¹⁰⁴

Whatever may have been the services of Pollio, Varus, or other friends, the credit goes to Caesar. Pollio was in politics a partisan of Antonius. The fact stands firm, not to be brushed aside by preconceived opinions or historical anachronisms. Nor does any safe and disinterested evidence bring Virgil into connection with Octavianus and his agents before 39 BC.

That year makes a turning point. Pollio's absence in Macedonia exposed Virgil to strong and subtle influences. The manner of his acquaintance [28]

¹⁰² CIL 1², p. 50. ¹⁰³ *Georg.* 3.41 ['your not-soft orders, Maecenas'].

¹⁰⁴ Virg. *Ecl.* 1.6–10 ['Meliboeus, it is a god who wrought for us this peace—for a god he shall ever be to me; often shall a tender lamb from old folds stain his altar. Of his grace my kine roam, as you see, and I, their master, play what I will on my rustic pipe', trans. H. R. Fairclough, modified]. Cf. the monthly sacrifice at 1.43.

with Maecenas—and with the young Caesar—is a matter for speculation. The false Probus invokes Cornelius Gallus, the alleged *condiscipulus* of Virgil.¹⁰⁵ Perhaps the agent was L. Varius Rufus, the poet and Epicurean. At any rate, Virgil, aided by Varius, brought another young poet of merit and promise, Q. Horatius Flaccus, to the notice of Maecenas. This was early in 38 BC.¹⁰⁶ In the course of the next year Maecenas with a company of diplomats travelled to Tarentum where Octavianus and Antonius were to meet in conference. Virgil, Varius, and Horace made the journey together, at least as far as Brundisium, so Horace relates in one of the most famous of his *Satires*.¹⁰⁷ Among the politicians was the Antonian L. Cocceius Nerva, who had been prominent three years earlier in the negotiations of Brundisium. Pollio, however, was absent. Perhaps they did not invite him; perhaps he had had enough.

It is reasonable to suppose that the *Eclogues* in their present form were published in 39 or 38 BC. Virgil now set himself, encouraged by Maecenas, to compose a poem on agriculture. Pollio finds no place in it, nor does the consular Alfenus Varus—perhaps he was dead. Cornelius Gallus had turned Caesarian before the War of Actium. The fourth book of the *Georgics* may at one time have contained a brief, amicable, and honorific mention of Virgil's friend, the poet and adventurer who had risen to become Viceroy of Egypt—though few will swallow Servius who alleges that several hundred lines were devoted to the *laudes Galli*.¹⁰⁸

The praises of Octavianus in the first *Eclogue* proclaim and consecrate Virgil's new allegiance (39 or 38 BC). A precious fact. There is a tendency to date far too early Virgil's acquaintance with Octavianus, a tendency not always conscious or reasoned. The anachronism perpetuates serious misconceptions, for example in the matter of the fourth *Eclogue*. [29] Augustus and the *Aeneid*, the national leader and the national epic, still lie far in the future.¹⁰⁹ Proper attention to the character and the politics of C. Asinius Pollio will provide a corrective. If the *Eclogues* reveal anything, they reveal the identity of Virgil's first patron—

a te principium, tibi desinet.

¹⁰⁵ Probus, *Ecl. Praef.*, cf. above, n. 81. Alleged by some to mean that Octavian and Virgil were *condiscipuli*: cf. [Vita Bern. 1].

¹⁰⁶ The date emerges from a combination of Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.54 and 2.6.40.

¹⁰⁷ [Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.39–44, 48.]

¹⁰⁸ [Serv. *Ecl.* 10.1; *Georg.* 4.1.] Cf. W. B. Anderson, 'Gallus and the Fourth *Georgic*', CQ 27 (1933), 39–45; E. Norden, 'Orpheus und Eurydice', *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akad., phil.-hist. Klasse* (1934), 626–83 = *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1966) 468–532; R. Syme, 'The Origin of Cornelius Gallus', CQ 32 (1938), 39–44, at 39 n. 1 [= RP 1.47–54, at 47 n. 2].

¹⁰⁹ Cf. W. W. Tarn, 'Alexander Helios and the Golden Age', JRS 22 (1932), 135–60.

Caesar and Augustus in Virgil

[1] It should be easy to ascertain to whom the word *Caesar* refers—Caesar the Dictator or his son by posthumous adoption, Octavianus, known after 27 BC as Augustus. The one was dead, the other alive. If that were not enough, there was another means of discrimination. In July of the year 44 BC, a comet appearing in the sky was hailed by the mob as the soul of the murdered Caesar. Superstition was soon exploited by policy. At the beginning of 42 BC the Senate and the People, subservient to the will of the Caesarian leaders, decreed that Julius Caesar be enrolled among the gods of the Roman State, as *Divus Julius*. His son could now add *Divi filius* to his nomenclature. He was already *C. Julius C. f. Caesar*, in virtue of the adoption, though his enemies, and the literary convention of a more recent age, prefer to recall his original family name, styling him not Caesar but Octavianus.

To contemporaries it was clear who was *Caesar*, whether he was saluted by formal or by informal terms of address. There remained, perhaps, room for confusion in some texts or contexts. First, the young Caesar might be regarded as an incarnation of *Divus Julius*—a belief which for a time he was loath to encourage.¹ Secondly, he too was acclaimed as a god, receiving homage, honours, and appellations, such as belonged to deities. Thus his earliest appearance in the poems of Virgil,

deus nobis otia fecit.
namque erit ille mihi semper deus, illius aram
saepe tener nostris ab ovilibus imbuet agnus.²

[2] Nevertheless, Virgil himself is nowhere a victim—and ought not to be a source—of confusion. It is only necessary to read his poems as contemporaries

[1] ¹ Pliny *Nat.* 2.94: *haec ille in publico; interiore gaudio sibi illam natu seque in eo nasci interpretatus est*. This passage, describing his feelings when the comet appeared, derives from Augustus' *Autobiography*.

² Virg. *Ecl.* 1.6–8 ['a god gave us this peace—for a god he shall ever be to me; often shall a tender lamb from our folds stain his altar', transl. H. R. Fairclough, modified], cf. 42–3. The present chapter deliberately refrains from discussing the minor poems attributed to Virgil, the problem of *Ecl.* 4 and the supposition that Daphnis in *Ecl.* 5 represents Julius Caesar.

did, without prepossessions. An obvious condition, but not easy to fulfil. To the modern reader, hampered by the history—and the literature—of two thousand years, the name *Caesar*, without other qualification, means the man who conquered Gaul, defeated Pompeius Magnus and destroyed the Roman Republic, not that less decorative but more useful character, Caesar Augustus, the founder of the imperial system.

Twice and twice only in all his works does Virgil refer to *Divus Julius* by name; each time ambiguity is excluded. In the *Eclogues* is mentioned the *sidus Julium*, the comet into which the soul of Caesar was represented—

ecce Dionaei processit Caesaris astrum.³

The second reference occurs in the famous passage at the end of the first book of the *Georgics* describing the signs and portents of civil strife that followed the assassination of Julius Caesar, when the sun dimmed his rays, threatening an evil generation with perpetual darkness:

ille etiam extincto miseratus Caesare Romam
cum caput obscura nitidum ferrugine texit
impiaque aeternam timuerunt saecula noctem.⁴

The reference is unequivocal—indeed, it is little more than a date. It is therefore not felt awkward or confusing that, less than forty lines later, comes an appeal to the gods of Rome to preserve Caesar, the living Caesar, and [3] allow him to rescue the world from anarchy—

Di patrii Indigetes et Romule Vestaque mater,
quae Tuscum Tiberim et Romana Palatia servas,
hunc saltem everso iuvenem succurrere saeclo
ne prohibete. satis iam pridem sanguine nostro
Laomedontae luimus periuria Troiae;
iam pridem nobis caeli te regia Caesar
invidet, atque hominum queritur curare triumphos,
quippe ubi fas versum atque nefas: tot bella per orbem.⁵

That is all, a comet and a date. A negative result, but of some importance. Three other Virgilian passages containing the word *Caesar* have been claimed

³ Virg. *Ecl.* 9.47 ['see, the star of Caesar, descendant of Dione, has come forth'].

⁴ Virg. *Georg.* 1.466–68 ['And it was he who felt for Rome that time that Caesar fell/ and veiled his gleaming head in darkness/ so dark that impious people feared that night would last forever'].

⁵ Virg. *Georg.* 1.498–505 ['Gods of my country, Indigetes, you, Romulus, and you, mother Vesta, who guard Tuscan Tiber and the Palatine of Rome, at least do not prevent this young man from succouring a world in ruins! Long enough has our life-blood paid for Laomedon's perjury at Troy; long enough have Heaven's court grudged you, Caesar, to us, complaining that you care for earthly triumphs! For here are right and wrong inverted', transl. H. R. Fairclough, modified].

by scholars in recent years as allusions to *Divus Julius*. A brief examination will show that they are nothing of the kind. This question goes far beyond the interpretation of several lines of a Latin poet—it is of central import to the whole ‘ideology’ of the Principate of Caesar Augustus.

In the dedication of the first book of the *Georgics*, after suitably invoking the gods of the countryside, Virgil calls on Caesar,

tuque adeo, quem quae sint habitura deorum
concilia incertum est, urbisne inuisere Caesar
terrarumque uelis curam, et te maximus orbis
auctorem frugum tempestatumque potentem
accipiat, cingens materna tempora myrto;
an deus immensi uenias maris ac tua nautae
[4] numina sola colant, tibi seruiat ultima Thule,
teque sibi generum Tethys emat omnibus undis,
anne nouum tardis sidus te mensibus addas,
qua locus Erigonen inter Chelasque sequentis
panditur (ipse tibi iam brachia contrahit ardens
Scorpius et caeli iusta plus parte reliquit);
quidquid eris (nam te nec sperant Tartara regem,
nec tibi regnandi ueniat tam dira cupido,
quamuis Elysios miretur Graecia campos
nec repetita sequi curet Proserpina matrem),
da facilem cursum atque audacibus adnue coeptis,
ignarosque uiae mecum miseratus agrestis
ingredere et uotis iam nunc adsuesce uocari.⁶

The poet debates which of the regions of the cosmos Caesar will in due course take for his province, earth or sea or sky—for he will hardly desire to become a monarch over the dead.

Who is this Caesar, the object of Virgil’s address? Surely Octavianus, who, since the adoption, was *C. Julius C. f. Caesar* before the law—and who, since about 39 BC, bore the public and official title of *Imperator Caesar divi f.* Yet it has recently been suggested that *Caesar* is no other than *Divus Julius*,

⁶ Virg. *Georg.* 1.24–42 [‘And you above all, Caesar, whom we know not what company of the gods shall claim in due course; whether you choose to watch over cities and care for our lands, that so the great globe may receive you as the giver of increase and lord of the seasons, wreathing your brows with your mother’s myrtle; whether you come as god of the boundless sea and sailors worship your deity alone, while farthest Thule owns your lordship and Tethys with the dowry of all her waves buys you to wed her daughter; or whether you add yourself as a new star to the lingering months, where, between the Virgin and the grasping Claws, a space is opening (lo! for you even now the blazing Scorpion draws in his arms, and has left more than a due portion of the heaven!)—whatever you are to be (for Tartarus hopes not for you as king, and may such monstrous lust of empire never seize you, though Greece is enchanted by the Elysian fields, and Proserpine reclaimed cares not to follow her mother), grant me a calm voyage, give assent to my bold emprise, and pitying with me the rustics who know not their way, proceed with me, and learn from now to be invoked with prayers!’, trans. H. R. Fairclough, modified].

‘definitely recognised as a god after the triumph of the Caesarian faction, but not yet assigned to a fixed place in worship’.⁷

This theory is peculiarly vulnerable to criticism. *Divus Julius*, having been consecrated at the beginning of 42 BC, already had his place among the [5] gods of the Roman State, even though he had to wait for thirteen years until his temple was completed. It is remarkable how little there is of Roman or Italian religion in all the *Georgics*; and it is in vain to scan the invocation to *Caesar* for indigenous features. On the contrary, it is patently Hellenistic, deriving from the practice which the Macedonians introduced of invoking their monarch after the so-called ‘Twelve Gods’.⁸ As such, the passage tells nothing about *Divus Julius*, or about native beliefs and cults.⁹ It is, however, an important document for the history of divine honours at Rome for the living ruler. Already in 36 BC the towns of Italy had placed images of Octavianus in their sanctuaries.¹⁰ It is important also for the contrast with the forms of public worship subsequently permitted by Augustus, after 27 BC.

But this is not all. When the promise of a higher status is held out to the great ones of earth, it is expedient if not necessary to indicate that the prospect of their elevation to the skies is not immediate; and certain ancient critics found fault with Virgil’s treatment of Octavianus in this passage.¹¹ Virgil, however, is in no hurry to deify the young Caesar. The word *mox* must be given its proper Latin meaning, not ‘soon’, but ‘in due course’. In the meantime, before joining the ranks of the gods, Caesar is urged to acquire the habit of being invoked in prayer—*votis iam nunc adsuesce vocari*. In truth, his merits have already made him a candidate for divinity. As Virgil says later in the same book of the *Georgics*, Heaven is impatiently waiting for Octavianus—

iam pridem nobis caeli te regia, Caesar,
invidet atque hominum queritur curare triumphos.¹²

[6] About the propriety of such language as Virgil uses when speaking of a living person, it will not be necessary to say very much. His speculation about

⁷ H. Mattingly, ‘Notes on Virgil’, *CR* 56 (1942), 18–20.

⁸ Compare the observations of G. Wissowa, ‘Das Prooemium von Virgils *Georgica*’, *Hermes* 52 (1917), 92–104, esp. 100–1.

⁹ Unless perhaps the notion that Octavianus might become a god of the lower world. Wissowa (‘Proemium’, 103) suggests that Virgil combines the Homeric kingdoms of Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades with the Roman categories of *di caelestes*, *terrestres*, *infern*i (Livy 1.12.10). Mr Mattingly (*CR* 56 [1942], 18) invokes Vediovis, the god worshipped by the *gens Julia*, cf. the inscription from Bovillae, *ILS* 2988. Vediovis has chthonic features; he was identified with Apollo, the deity chosen by Octavianus as his peculiar patron, cf. C. Koch, *Der römische Juppiter* (Frankfurt 1937) 80–2.

¹⁰ App. *BC* 5.132.

¹¹ Cf. Servius, *ad loc.* Mr Mattingly (*CR* 56 [1942], 18) regards this consideration as proof that Virgil cannot have been referring to a person still alive.

¹² Virg. *Georg.* 1.503–4 [‘Long enough have Heaven’s courts grudged you, Caesar, to us, complaining that you care for earthly triumphs!’], trans. H. R. Fairclough].

the future status and location of the young Caesar certainly appears forced and frigid.¹³ Especially repugnant is the suggestion that room might be found for him among the constellation—a conceit that Lucan recalled when he flattered the Emperor Nero.¹⁴ However delicate might be the taste of a poet, his resources were sorely taxed when he had to honour dynasts who emulated the conquests of Alexander the Macedonian and arrogated to themselves the names and titles of divinities. Even Virgil was not always happy. In the second book of the *Georgics* he terminates a catalogue of the heroes of Rome with a picture of Octavianus:

et te, maxime Caesar,
qui nunc extremis Asiae iam victor in oris
inbellem avertis Romanis arcibus Indum.¹⁵

It is no great compliment to the victor of Actium that he should be shown defending the towers of Rome from harmless unwarlike Indians. Nor will every judgement acquiesce in the baroque pageantry with which Virgil in the proem of the third book celebrates or anticipates the triumph of Octavianus.¹⁶

If the young military leader was an awkward topic, with temptations to bathos or bombast, one thing at least was straightforward—he could not be left out. Maecenas is mentioned at the beginning of the first book of the *Georgics*. [7] It would not have been tactful to omit the patron who stood behind Maecenas, namely the leader of the Caesarian party, *imperator Caesar*, as they called him at the time. The introduction to the first book of the *Georgics* is the proem and the dedication of all four books.¹⁷

It is evident that the Caesar invoked by Virgil is the living dynast not the divine parent. The negative arguments here adduced are adequate. It will not therefore be necessary—or even desirable—to debate at length the corollary of the theory that *Divus Julius* is here referred to by Virgil, namely that this passage was written shortly after 42 BC. The difficulty, it must be confessed, is squarely faced by the author of that theory. He argues that the end of the first book (lines 466–514, discussed above) also belongs to this remarkably early

¹³ [2] As Messalla is made to observe in the *Imaginary Conversations* of Landon: 'What think you of the Scorpion drawings his arms in, that Octavius may have room enough?—or the despair of Tartarus at missing such a treasure?—or the backwardness of Proserpina to follow her mother? Here are together eight such verses as I would give eighty bushels of wheat to eradicate from the verses of a friend'.

¹⁴ Luc. 1.45–55.

¹⁵ Virg. *Georg.* 2.170–2 ['and you, greatest of all, Caesar, who, already victorious in Asia's farthest bounds, now drives the craven Indian from our hills of Rome', trans. H. R. Fairclough].

¹⁶ Virg. *Georg.* 3.16–39; cf. below, n. 21.

¹⁷ This is emphasized by F. Jacoby, 'Das Proemium des Lucretius', *Hermes* 56 (1920), 37. He says that Virgil had to mention 'der nationale Führer'.

date.¹⁸ For example, the mention of neighbour cities at strife is taken as a precise allusion to the War of Perugia in 41–40 BC:

vicinae ruptis inter se legibus urbes
arma ferunt.¹⁹

The date at which the different parts of the *Georgics* were written is a large question; and, given Virgil's methods of composition, very intricate. Many of the passages of definite historical reference could have been—and probably were—subsequently inserted in the context in which they now stand. However that may be, there is no reason at all to support a dating of this passage shortly after 40 BC. One need not adduce the development of Virgil's thought, style, and language, an [8] important and palpable topic. It will suffice to consider the situation in 32 BC. After Sex. Pompeius had been defeated (36 BC), things began to settle down to Italy, and some may have hoped for peace between the rival dynasts. If so, not for long. In 32 BC, with hostilities imminent between Octavianus and Antonius, all the evils of civil war came back, among them the danger of strife in Italy—it will be recalled that Italy was by no means strong behind the young Caesar, that Bononia, for example, was in the *clientela* of the Antonii.²⁰ The situation did not merely reflect Perugia—it was contemporary and terrifying.

Rome's sole salvation was the young Caesar, as Virgil solemnly affirms; and it is to the same Caesar that the dedication of the first book of the *Georgics* refers, whenever it was written. To judge by internal evidence only, it could have been written at any time between 36 and 29 BC. However, as it is the dedication to the whole work, it was perhaps the last portion to be composed (30 or 29 BC).²¹

The next passage comes in the first book of the *Aeneid*. Jupiter, unfolding the decrees of fate, reveals to Venus the divinely ordained history of the line of Aeneas her son and the imperial glory of Rome, culminating in the advent of a Caesar of Trojan stock—

nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar,
imperium oceano, famam qui terminet astris,
Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo.
[9] hunc tu olim caelo, spoliis Orientis onustum
accipies securus; vocabitur hic quoque votis.
aspera tum positus mitescent saecula bellis;

¹⁸ H. Mattingly, *CR* 56 (1942), 19.

¹⁹ Virg. *Georg.* 1.510–11 ['breaking the covenants which bind them, neighbouring cities draw the sword', trans. H. R. Fairclough].

²⁰ Suet. *Aug.* 17.2; Cass. Dio 50.6.3.

²¹ In that case later than Virg. *Georg.* 3.16–39, commonly held to have been composed in anticipation of the triumph celebrated by Octavianus in 29 BC. Norden argued for a date after the triumph, 'Vergilstudien', *Hermes* 38 (1893), 517–18.

cana Fides, et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus,
iura dabunt; dirae ferro et compagibus artis
claudentur Belli portae; Furor impius intus,
saeva sedens super arma et centum vinctus aënis
post tergum nodis, fremet horridus ore cruento.²²

Who is that Caesar, conqueror of the world, laden with the spoils of the Orient? He is destined that way, *olim*, to be taken up into Heaven by his ancestress. He will be invoked in prayer—*vocabitur hic quoque votis*. To be compared is the phraseology of the dedication of the *Georgics* (1.42) where Octavianus is addressed—*votis iam nunc adsuesce vocari*. It is clearly the Caesar who, by defeating Antonius and the Queen of Egypt, has regained from Rome the eastern lands—and who, so men expected confidently, would soon deal with the Parthians. If this were not enough, this Caesar ends the civil wars, a consummation that is symbolised by the rival brothers Romulus and Remus, reconciled at last; internecine strife, *furor impius*, is bound in chains, and cast into prison.

Caesar the Dictator was a conqueror, but he brought no concord. It can only be described as an aberration of judgement when some scholars fancy him to be subject of Jupiter's prophecy.²³ The reference to Octavianus is patent and precise. Wars foreign and domestic having been ended by the young Caesar, [10] the Senate of Rome at the beginning of the year 29 BC, decreed that the Temple of Janus be closed—*claudentur belli portae*.

Prayers will be offered to Caesar—an important detail, being a reference to the cult of the living ruler (as in *Georgics* 1.42) and not merely another way of

²² Virg. *Aen.* 1.286–96 ['From this noble stock there will be born a Trojan Caesar to bound his empire by Oceanus at the limits of the world, and his fame by the stars. He will be called Julius, a named passed down to him from the great Iulus. In time to come, have no fear, you will receive him in the sky, laden with the spoils of the East. He too will be called upon in prayer. Then wars will be laid aside and the years of bitterness will be over. Silver-haired *Fides* and Vesta, and Romulus Quirinus with his brother Remus, will sit dispensing justice. The dread Gates of War with their tight fastenings of steel will then be closed, and godless Strife will sit inside them on his murderous armour roaring hideously from bloody mouth, hands shackled behind his back with a hundred bands of bronze', trans. D. West, slightly modified].

²³ For example, T. Frank, *Virgil. A Biography* (New York 1922) and R. S. Conway, *Virgil. Aeneid Book I* (Cambridge 1935). These scholars appear to have neglected E. Norden, 'Vergils Aeneis im Lichte ihrer Zeit', *Neue Jahrbücher* 7 (1901), 249–82, esp. the arguments in 253–4 [= *Kleine Schriften*, 363–4]. According to Conway, '286–90 are certainly to be taken (with Servius, whose authority on such point is paramount) as a prophecy of Julius Caesar'. He does not, however, state why the authority of Servius should be regarded as paramount. It is precisely in his treatment of references to contemporary events in the poems of Virgil that the scholiast is most inadequate. His remarks on *Ecl.* 4.1 are a flagrant example—he does not know the identity of the Balkan tribe conquered by Pollio, and he dates Pollio's triumph before his consulate. Many delusions have been fostered by an incautious acceptance of 'authorities' like Servius: compare the remarks of the present writer, [2] 'Pollio, Saloninus and Salonae', *CQ* 31 (1937), 39–48 [= *RP* 1.18–30]. For other Servian blunders in the interpretation of the *Aeneid* see below, notes 27, 48, and 53.

saying that he will mount to Heaven. It will be noted that Caesar is not described as *Augustus*; therefore the lines are anterior to 27 BC. In fact they are probably among the earliest to be composed of all the *Aeneid*, to be attributed to 29 or 28 BC.

This being so, it is not necessary to adduce in confirmation a contemporary parallel—perhaps a contemporary parody. In the second book of the *Satires* of Horace Tiresias opens a mock prophecy with the words:

tempore quo iuvenis Parthis horrendus, ab alto
demissum genus Aenea, tellure marique
magnus erit.²⁴

The question is, indeed, of more interest to another problem—the date of publication of the *Satires* of Horace: it provides a valuable indication.

The third and last passage where the word *Caesar* has been wrongly interpreted occurs in another prophecy. When Aeneas visits the lower world, his father Anchises calls up before him the long roll of the heroes of Roman history, from the mythical (not to say fictitious) Kings of Alba Longa down to the present, ending with the Marcelli and a melancholy commemoration of Augustus' ill-fated [11] nephew. The central theme is, very properly, Augustus:

hic Caesar et omnis Iuli
progenies magnum caeli uentura sub axem.
hic vir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis,
Augustus Caesar, divi genus, aurea condet
saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arva
Saturno quondam, super et Garamantes et Indos
proferet imperium; iacet extra sidera tellus,
extra anni solisque vias, ubi caelifer Atlas
axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum.
huius in aduentum iam nunc et Caspia regna
responsis horrent divum et Maeotia tellus,
et septemgemini turbant trepida ostia Nili.
nec vero Alcides tantum telluris obivit,
fixerit acripedem cervam licet, aut Erymanthi
pacarit nemora et Lernam tremefecerit arcu;
nec qui pampineis victor iuga flectit habenis
Liber, agens celso Nysae de vertice tigris.²⁵

²⁴ Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.62–4 ['At that time when the young man dreaded by the Parthians, an offspring derived from the noble Aeneas, shall be mighty by land and sea'].

²⁵ Virg. *Aen.* 6.789–805 ['Here is Caesar, and all the sons of Iulus about to come under the great vault of the sky. Here is the man whose coming you so often hear prophesied, here he is, Augustus Caesar, son of a god, the man who will bring back the golden years to the fields of Latium once ruled over by Saturn, and extend Rome's empire beyond the Indians and the Garamantes to a land beyond the stars, beyond the yearly path of the sun, where Atlas holds on

Here, as in *Aeneid* 1.286–96, the victor in war and master of Rome appears as a world conqueror, but in more detail. As Norden has demonstrated, the imagery derives from laudations of Alexander the Great;²⁶ and the comparison evoked by Virgil with Hercules and Bacchus is relevant, not merely for the extent of territory those heroes have traversed in toil or conquest, but, very precisely, [12] because they were the inevitable precedents of demigods acquiring by merit full status on Olympus.

But what of Caesar—*Caesar et omnis Iuli progenies* (6.789–90)? Certain editions of the poet assign the word *Caesar* to *Divus Julius*;²⁷ and Norden appears to hold the same view, for in his discussions of the *Panegyricus Augusti* he begins his quotation of the text, not with 6.789, but with 6.792. This will not do. It is indeed asserted that Julius Caesar must have been mentioned among the Julii.²⁸ That argument has no validity at all. When Caesar was consecrated, he passed out of the *gens Julia*: his effigy was no longer carried among their *imagines*.²⁹ It must be repeated that the word *Caesar* in a source of Augustan date should refer, not to *Divus Julius*, but to his son and heir. Evident in itself, this fact is made clear if a slight change of punctuation is made: instead of a full stop at the end of 6.780, to be found in most editions, a semicolon is called for. That is to say, the identity of *Caesar* in 6.789 is explicitly revealed by the words

hic vir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis,
Augustus Caesar

[‘Here he is the man whose coming you so often hear prophesied, here he is, Augustus Caesar’, trans. D. West]

The phrase is especially solemn and religious. To the modern reader *Augustus Caesar* might appear normal and commonplace. It is not so. The prose order, commonly found on official documents, is *Caesar Augustus*. The Caesar

his shoulder the sky all studded with burning stars and turns it on its axis. The kingdoms round the Caspian Sea and Lake Maeotis are even now quaking at the prophecies of his coming. The seven mouths of the Nile are in turmoil and alarm. Hercules himself did not make his way to so many lands though his arrow pierced the hind with hooves of bronze, though he gave peace to the woods of Erymanthus and made Lerna tremble at his bow. Nor did triumphing Bacchus ride so far when he drove his tiger-drawn chariot down from the high peak of Nysa’, trans. D. West].

²⁶ E. Norden, ‘Ein Panegyricus auf Augustus in Vergils *Aeneis*’, *RhM* 54 (1899), 466–82 [= *Kleine Schriften*, 423–36]; *P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis Buch VI* (Leipzig 1934³) 323.

²⁷ For example, G. Janell, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, ed. maior (Leipzig, Teubner 1920). Not, however, J. W. Mackail (*The Aeneid of Virgil*, Oxford 1930): on l. 789 he says ‘Caesar is of course Augustus, as always in the *Aeneid* ... the name is repeated with amplification in l. 792’. As might be expected (cf. above, n. 23), the scholiast Servius here misunderstands Julius Caesar to be referred to.

²⁸ E. Norden, ‘Vergilstudien’, *Hermes* 38 (1893), 502. In his edition of *Aen.* 6 Norden does not discuss the line: it is therefore to be presumed that he stood by his earlier opinion.

²⁹ Cass. Dio 47.19.2; cf. 52.34.2; 46.4.

introduced in 6.789 receives thereby an emphatic designation, as though to banish any possible doubt.

Caesar Augustus is no longer only the world-conqueror of divine ancestry [13] who puts an end to the civil wars: he will renew in Latium the age of gold. It is difficult not to see a reference to the *Ludi Saeculares*. It is true that they were not celebrated until 17 BC. But, on one calculation, the festival would (and should) have been held in 23 or in 22 BC; and there are indications that the *Ludi Saeculares* were instantly expected.³⁰ This is one of them. Hence valuable evidence for the date of composition of the *Panegyricus Augusti*.

Which is instructive, but not surprising. The *Panegyricus Augusti* imitates the praise of Alexander. It also provides its own approximate date of composition. But that is not all. Virgil introduces Caesar Augustus in the line of the Kings of Rome, between Romulus and Numa Pompilius. The juxtaposition with Romulus is natural—yet in certain respects delicate. The poet shows consummate art.

In the last age of the Republic the figure of Romulus, the founder of Rome, began to acquire no small contemporary interest, being invoked in political argument when the ordering of the state was in question. Thus in the historian Sallust Sulla is referred to as 'the sinister Romulus';³¹ and a pamphlet, deriding Cicero's claim to have saved Rome and founded it anew, salutes him as the Romulus from Arpinum.³² It was in this generation that Romulus, taken up into heaven after death, was identified with the god Quirinus. Caesar's heir went much further. In the years 31–28 BC he was practically identified with Romulus, as the founder of the Roman State.³³ The language of Livy was understood by contemporaries: the historian speaks of Romulus as *deum deo natum, regem parentemque urbis Romanae*.³⁴ Romulus was highly relevant to the political situation after Actium, and to the aspirations of Octavianus. Already *Divi filius*, he desired also to be called [14] Romulus.³⁵ Instead, the name of Augustus was adopted—*sed sanctius et reverentius visum est nomen Augusti*.³⁶

It was sanctified—and it was much safer. There was a hint in the ancient and venerable *Augustus*, for Ennius told how Rome was founded *augusto augurio*.³⁷ That was enough. Though Romulus was honoured as the founder, his repute was by no means unequivocal. Recent and disquieting features had

³⁰ Norden, 'Panegyricus', 480 [= *Kleine Schriften*, 434–5]; H. Mattingly, 'Virgil's Golden Age: Sixth *Aeneid* and Fourth Eclogue', *CR* 48 (1934), 161–5.

³¹ Sall. *Hist.* 1.55.5 M. [= 48.5 McG. = 49.5 R.].

³² 'Sallust', in *Cic.* 4.7.

³³ Cf. J. Gagé, 'Romulus-Augustus', *MEFRA* 47 (1930), 138–81; A. von Premerstein, *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats (Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Abt., n. F. 15)* (Munich 1937) 8–12; E. Kornemann, 'Zum Augustusjahr', *Klio* 31 (1938), 81–91.

³⁴ Livy 1.16.3.

³⁵ Cass. Dio 53.16.7; Flor. 2.34.66.

³⁶ Flor. 2.34.66 ['But the name of Augustus was deemed more holy and venerable'].]

[3] ³⁷ Ennius, quoted by Varro, *Res Rust.* 3.1.2.

accrued to the legend. Some argue that they derive from the Sullan period.³⁸ Even if this is true, the parallel between Romulus and Caesar the Dictator, vivid and inescapable, became the decisive factor, lending no little verisimilitude in the latest accounts, such as the version followed by Plutarch. Cicero was probably familiar with an unfavourable conception of Romulus; but the exposition in his *De re publica* is deliberately improving in character—his Romulus, subservient to the authority and guidance of the Senate, respecting the auspices and averse from harsh punishments, is a fancy picture.³⁹ However, the fate of Caesar is needed for the full development of the story.

Livy may be influenced by the parallel with Caesar: he admits that Romulus was more acceptable to the People than to the Senate—and above all, he was popular with the army. Touching the death of Romulus, he reports, but, as might be expected, inclines to disregard, the shocking rumour that the King was murdered by the Senate.⁴⁰ He probably wrote the first book of his history at a time when Caesar's heir was still actively promoting the cult of Romulus. Other sources are more explicit about the attitude of the Senate, for example Plutarch.⁴¹ Romulus degenerated into a tyrant. The senators no longer had any effective share in [15] public business. Their convocation by the King was a mere sham—they listened in silence to his commands, their only privilege was to be apprised of them sooner than was the People. Hence it was natural that the Senate should be incriminated for his mysterious disappearance.

The Caesarian colouring of this story is evident. Octavianus, the military demagogue who had won sole leadership of the Caesarian party, saw—or was made to see—the danger of insisting upon his claim to be a second Romulus: he had no desire to provide a wanton excuse for his own assassination. Therefore, after changing the definition of his primacy in 27 BC, the head of the Roman State, who is no longer *Dux* but *Princeps*, gradually abandons the assimilation to the founder, attractive though it was, for Romulus, in the form of Quirinus, was deified.⁴² Romulus still keeps a place in the inspired literature of the age as the type of a demi-god who, like Hercules, Bacchus, and others, achieves divine rank as a reward earned by his services towards mankind. Those demi-gods are the precedents that will justify the ascension of Augustus when he passes from among men.⁴³

³⁸ A. Rosenberg, *RE* IIA, 1097.

³⁹ *Cic. Rep.* 2.15–19.

⁴⁰ Livy 1.16.4: *fuisse credo tum quoque aliquos qui discerptum regem patrum manibus taciti arguerent; manavit enim haec quoque sed perobscura fama* ['I believe that even then there were some who quietly argued that he had been torn apart by the senators; a tradition to that effect, albeit a very vague one, has persisted to our day'].

⁴¹ *Plut. Rom.* 27.

⁴² Compare observations by the present writer, *RR* 318.

⁴³ Horace, *Carm.* 3.3.15; *Epist.* 2.1.5.

It is misleading to label Virgil a court poet. But he was in close sympathy with the policy of the government, and under the influence of the ideals it fostered and propagated. In the dedication of the third book of the *Georgics*, a passage written in 30 or 29 BC, he had frankly identified Octavianus with the god Quirinus—*victorisque arma Quirini*;⁴⁴ and, in the list of the Kings of Rome retailed by Anchises in the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, it was natural to mention Augustus after Romulus. But here the poet shows his skill. Between Romulus and [16] Augustus are inserted twelve lines in praise of Rome. Direct filiation is thus interrupted—perhaps the link was closer in an earlier version.

Romulus, it has been shown, might suggest Caesar the Dictator. Where in the record of the Roman past, is that uncomfortable Caesar to be lodged? Again the poet reveals his artifices and, more than that, the opinions propagated by the new rulers of Rome.

Both Romulus and Caesar the Dictator were delicate subjects. Romulus has been disposed of. Julius Caesar may not be mentioned by name in the epic poem, the central figure of which is Aeneas—who is also Augustus: he is therefore removed from all proximity, verbal or topographical, to Caesar Augustus. Yet the Dictator occurs in the poem, anonymous, not as the divine parent of Caesar Augustus, but as horrid example. In the list of Republican heroes, between Camillus, who repelled the Gauls, and Mummius, who conquered Corinth, are interpolated, out of any order of time or propriety, Caesar the Dictator and Pompeius Magnus—

illae autem paribus quas fulgere cernis in armis,
concordes animae nunc et dum nocte prementur,
heu quantum inter se bellum, si lumina uitae
attigerint, quantas acies stragemque ciebunt,
aggeribus socer Alpinis atque arce Monoeci
descendens, gener aduersis instructus Eois!
ne, pueri, ne tanta animis adulescite bella
neu patriae ualidas in uiscera vertite viris;
[17] tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo,
proice tela manu, sanguis meus!⁴⁵

The poet confronts the rival dynasts whose criminal ambition plunged the world into war. But he will not call them by their proper names. This is

⁴⁴ Virg. *Georg.* 3.27.

⁴⁵ Virg. *Aen.* 6.826–35 [“Those two spirits you see gleaming there in their well-matched armour are in harmony now while they are buried in night, but if once they reach the light of life, what a terrible war they will stir up between them! What battles! What carnage when the father-in-law swoops from the ramparts of the Alps and his citadel of Monaco and his son-in-law leads against him the embattled armies of the East! O my sons, do not harden your hearts to such wars. Do not turn your strong hands against the flesh of your motherland. You who are sprung from Olympus, you must be the first to show clemency. Throw down your weapons. O blood of my blood!”, trans. D. West].

intelligible. They were recent, all too recent. Men tried to forget the authors of iniquity: at the least, they could suppress names of evil memory, so detestable were the civil wars. It is surprising that Virgil in another passage should actually refer to Marcus Antonius by name.⁴⁶ To mention *Caesar* was inexpedient, for that name belonged to the living Caesar, Caesar Augustus. As for Pompeius, another reason made for silence: his *gentilicium*, blatantly non-Latin by its form, was a recent and not altogether welcome addition to the nomenclature of the Roman *nobilitas*. Like the same *Mummius*, it was not congenial to the higher poetry, even had its political connotations been innocuous.⁴⁷

A psychological revulsion from the names of the leaders of Roman armies in a civil war will readily be understood. And, as might be expected, to the catalogue of Roman heroes Marius cannot gain admittance, or Sulla, though the one saved Italy from the German hordes, the other broke the power of Mithridates the Great and established proper, ordered, and oligarchic government at Rome. Both are damned, for both were guilty of war between citizens, *impia arma*.⁴⁸

The manner in which Caesar the Dictator and Pompeius Magnus are introduced has caused unnecessary worry to modern commentators. Ribbeck wished to transpose the passage and put it after the *Panegyricus Augusti*—a ludicrous proposal, for it [18] involved thrusting Pompeius Magnus into the Julian House or the line of the Kings of Rome, to neither of which does he belong. Other scholars have felt unhappy. Norden in his earliest discussion of the passage stated that the lines could not have been recited in the presence of Augustus, because they contained a criticism of his parent; and he supposed that Virgil, when he completed his work, would have added some mention of the imperial achievement of Caesar (and of Pompeius).⁴⁹ Subsequently, however, Norden explained Virgil's exhortation to Caesar by invoking Caesar's amnesty after the Battle of Thapsus, and, carrying the argument about civil war a stage further, alluded to Augustus' policy of mercy, as advertised in the *Res Gestae*. The recital, he holds, need not have offended Augustus.⁵⁰

But this is not enough. At the outbreak of the war with Pompeius clemency was proclaimed and exploited by Caesar, to discredit the memory of Sulla and the party of the oligarchs; and it was a common phrase, not always justified by

⁴⁶ Virg. *Aen.* 8.685.

⁴⁷ Virgil does not mention Mummius by name.

⁴⁸ Similarly, by choosing the phrase *Gracchi genus* (l. 842) the poet avoids too direct a reference to the two tribunes of unhappy memory, and includes their father, of unimpeachable repute, who married the daughter of Scipio Africanus. Servius, however, goes wrong when he says *ergo Scipiones dicit per Gracchi genus*.

⁴⁹ E. Norden, 'Vergilstudien', *Hermes* 28 (1893), 503. He therefore suggested that the passage was inserted where it now stands, clumsily, by the editors after Virgil's death.

⁵⁰ In his edition of *Aen.* 6 (Leipzig and Berlin 1934³) 330.

facts, in the propaganda of the generals who fought for Caesar's inheritance.⁵¹ But that is not the point. Julius Caesar is not merely exhorted to disarm—he ought to disarm before Pompeius, his rival:

tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo,
proice tela manu, sanguis meus!

['You who are sprung from Olympus, you must be the first to show clemency. Throw down your weapons. O blood of my blood!']

Yet this is *Divus Julius*, the divine parent of Caesar Augustus. He is not merely condemned for participation in civil strife—he is condemned before Pompeius. Nor is it at all likely that Virgil intended to pay full honour to Caesar the [19] Dictator as an empire-builder. Virgil's attitude, it will be shown, is easily comprehensible—and quite in keeping with the sentiments and the policy of Augustus.

So much for Caesar the Dictator, otherwise known as *Divus Julius*. As for Caesar Augustus, there is another passage that honours him as the crown and the culmination of all the history of Rome—the *Shield of Aeneas* in the eighth book of the *Aeneid*.⁵² Beginning with the she-wolf and the birth of Romulus and Remus, the *Shield* depicts the legends in order down to the repulse of the Gauls from the Capitol, and then, after a brief glimpse of heaven and hell, passes at once to describe the Battle of Actium and the triumph of Augustus. Again, no mention of the divine parent by name. Yet the curious reader might be tempted to linger and meditate upon the eschatological scenes of the *Shield of Aeneas*:

Tartareas etiam sedes, alba ostia Ditis,
et scelerum poenas, et te, Catilina, minaci
pendentem scopulo Furiarumque ora tremementem,
secretosque pios, his dantem iura Catonem.⁵³

The scenes are simple, and antithetic enough—Catilina tormented by Furies, Cato giving laws to the blessed dead. The choice of characters is not fortuitous. The career of Caesar the Dictator was not altogether edifying—he was on the 'wrong side' in politics, against the settled government of the oligarchy. Further, his enemies accused him of complicity in the revolutionary designs of Catiline, an allegation that became more and more circumstantial with the passage of time. [20] Catilina, therefore, is damagingly relevant to Caesar. This is

⁵¹ Cf. Syme, *RR* 159–60, 299, 480.

⁵² Virg. *Aen.* 8.626–731.

⁵³ Virg. *Aen.* 8.667–70 ['the habitations of the dead in Tartarus, the tall gateway of Dis and the punishments of the damned, with you, Catiline, hanging from your beetling crag and shivering at the faces of the Furies. There too were the righteous, in a place apart, and Cato administering justice', trans. D. West, modified]. It will be noted that Servius on this passage supposes Cato the Censor to be meant: the height of ineptitude.

confirmed by the identity of the other denizen of the next world, the venerable Cato, the champion of 'liberty and the laws', the martyr of the Republic, in his life a bitter enemy of Caesar the Dictator, in death perhaps a greater power still.

Nobody need doubt where was the place allotted to Julius Caesar. It was deep in Virgil's hell, among the superior and successful criminals,

ausi omnes immane nefas ausoque potiti.⁵⁴

Caesar would be found not far from that venal scoundrel, identified by some with the Caesarian Antonius, who sold his country to a despotic rule,

vendidit his auro patriam dominumque potentem
imposuit, fixit leges atque refixit.⁵⁵

To resume. The word *Caesar* with reference to the divine parent is employed only twice by Virgil, once in the *Eclogues*, meaning the *Julium sidus* and once in the *Georgics*, to indicate a point of time, *extincto Caesare*. In the *Aeneid* the figure of Caesar the Dictator does occur, once, but his name is suppressed, his behaviour condemned; the poet, politically alert and artful in the disposition of his material, banishes this compromising character from the vicinity of Augustus.

The *Aeneid* is Augustus' poem, prefiguring him as Aeneas, the ancestor of the Julian line; and Augustus is there all the time, even though he be not mentioned by name.⁵⁶ It is perhaps no exaggeration to call the poem a political allegory. [21] This is illustrated by small details—and in the large design.⁵⁷ Guided by destiny and overcoming all hazards, Aeneas at last fulfils his mission and lays the foundation for Rome's future greatness:

tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem.⁵⁸

So does the young Caesar, conscious of duty, *pietate insignis et armis*⁵⁹ avenge his parent, triumph over all adversaries, and, in his triumph, achieve order and concord.

⁵⁴ Virg. *Aen.* 6.624 ['They have all dared to attempt some monstrous crime against the gods and have succeeded in their attempt'].

[5] ⁵⁵ Virg. *Aen.* 6.621–22: ['Here is the man who has sold his native land for gold, and set a tyrant over it, putting up tablets with new laws for a price and for a price removing them', trans. D. West]. According to Macrobius (*Sat.* 6.1.29) this couplet was taken over by Virgil, with slight modifications, from the poem of his friend Varius. Cf. Norden, 'Vergilstudien', 514–[21], and his commentary in *Aen.* 6., *ad loc.* Note also Norden's theory that *invidia infelix* in Virgil's earliest picture of Hell (*Georg.* 3.37) is a reference to Antonius ('Vergils Aeneis im lichte ihrer Zeit', *Neue Jahrbücher* 7 [1901], 249–82, 313–34, at 319–20 [= *Kleine Schriften zum klassischen Altertum* (Berlin 1966) 358–421, at 403–5]).

⁵⁶ Cf. Norden's commentary, p. 362: 'denn er selbst bietet in seinem Ahn ja den Mittelpunkt des ganzen auch da wo er nicht eigen genannt worden ist'.

⁵⁷ Cf. Syme, *RR* 462–3.

⁵⁸ Virg. *Aen.* 1.33 ['So heavy was the cost of founding the Roman race', trans. D. West].

⁵⁹ Virg. *Aen.* 6.403.

From its divine or legendary origins all the history of Rome leads up to the rule of Caesar Augustus. This, the central conception of the *Aeneid*, is expressed in three passages already discussed, the *Prophecy of Jupiter*, the *Revelation of Anchises*, and the *Shield of Aeneas*. In the first of these he is Caesar, the Julian of Trojan stock: the other passages employ the designation Augustus Caesar. For the sake of completeness will here be added the climax of the poem in the twelfth book, where Caesar Augustus, in the person of Aeneas, is vividly relevant to the history of his age, Aeneas, concluding a solemn treaty with the King of the Latins, proclaims his aversion from regal ambitions, his desire that Trojan and Latin should meet and join in harmony:

non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubeo
nec mihi regna peto: paribus ac legibus ambae
invictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant.⁶⁰

This is surely a symbol of the union of Rome and Italy, achieved at last in blood [22] and tears by the young Caesar, a union which, however, will not result in domination or monarchy. The poet provides a celestial counterpart to this happy ending. Juno, realising that she can no longer prevent the establishment of the Trojans in Italy, states her terms—invader and native must coalesce, but the Latins shall not be compelled to abandon their language or nationality. Rome will grow powerful with the help of *Italia virtus*, and Troy must be forgotten:

cum iam conubiis pacem felicibus (esto)
component, cum iam leges et foedera iungent,
ne vetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos
neu Troas fieri iubebas Teucrosque uocari
aut vocem mutare uiros aut uertere uestem.
sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula reges,
sit Romana potens Italia virtute propago:
occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia.⁶¹

Jupiter agrees, and enounces his purpose in significant language:

sermonem Ausonii patrium moresque tenebunt,
utque est nomen erit; commixti corpore tantum

⁶⁰ Virg. *Aen.* 12.189–91 [‘I shall not order Italians to obey Trojans, nor do I seek royal power for myself. Both peoples shall move forward into an everlasting treaty, undefeated, and equal before the law’, trans. D. West, modified].

⁶¹ Virg. *Aen.* 12.821–8 [‘When at last their marriages are blessed—I offer no obstruction—when at last they come together in peace and make their laws and treaties together, do not command the Latins to change their laws and treaties together, do not command the Latins to change their ancient name in their own land, to become Trojans and be called Teucrians. They are men. Do not make them change their voice or native dress. Let there be Latium. Let the Alban kings live on from generation to generation and the stock of Rome be made mighty by the manly courage of Italy. Troy has fallen. Let it lie, Troy and the name of Troy’, trans. D. West].

subsident Teucri. morem ritusque sacrorum
 adiciam faciamque omnis uno ore Latinos,
 hinc genus Ausonio mixtum quod sanguine surget,
 supra homines, supra ire deos pietate videbis,
 nec gens ulla tuos aequae celebrabit honores.⁶²

[23] The insistence that Troy be not rebuilt is echoed by a contemporary poet. In the most remarkable of his patriotic Odes, Horace introduces Juno in the council of the gods forbidding the Romans to renew Troy:

Sed bellicosus fata Quiritibus
 hac lege dico, ne nimium pii
 rebusque fidentes avitae
 tecta velint reparare Troiae.⁶³

The modern interpreter detects in the theme of Troy the repercussion of the rumour that Caesar the Dictator intended to transfer the capital from Rome to Ilium or Alexandria.⁶⁴ More important was the danger, apparent and tangible in the wars of the Triumviral period, when Antonius ruled the East at Alexandria—the seat of power might depart from Rome and the primacy of the Roman People be impaired or abrogated. But that does not exhaust—let alone explain—the significance of Troy.

Troy is a symbol of the un-Roman element in Italy and of the un-Roman period of Roman history, which, since the Gracchi, had begotten discord, civil war, the demagogue, and finally the tyrant. If Rome was to return to the *antiqui mores* and re-establish a *res publica*, Troy, and all it stood for, had to be eliminated. With Troy, the ancestry of the *gens Julia*—and the claims of *Divus Julius*—though impossible to abolish, must be allowed to recede from prominence.

The historical importance of the passages of the *Aeneid* in which Virgil refers to *Divus Julius* or Augustus is evident, not least when names are suppressed. [24] They are cardinal documents for the interpretation of Roman nationalism in the Principate of Caesar Augustus. If it were possible to determine the date at which they were written it should cast some light upon the development of that phenomenon.

⁶² Virg. *Aen.* 12.834–40 [‘The people of Ausonia will keep the tongue of their fathers and their ancient ways. As their name is, so shall it remain. The Trojans will join them in body only and will then be submerged. Ritual I will give and the modes of worship, and I will make them all Latins, speaking one tongue. You will see that the people who arise from this admixture of Ausonian blood will be above all men, above the gods, in devotion and no other race will be their equals in paying you honour’, trans. D. West].

⁶³ Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.57–60 [‘But I tell the fates to the warlike Quirites on this condition, that they do not, out of too much piety and self-confidence, decide to rebuild the roofs of ancestral Troy’].

⁶⁴ Suet. *DJ* 79.4; cf. T. Mommsen, *Reden und Aufsätze* (Berlin 1912) 173–4; W. Warde Fowler, *Roman Essays and Interpretations* (London 1911) 216–21.

The final reconciliation of Trojan and Latin in the twelfth book, with the abolition of Troy and the Trojan name as its condition, might not be placed later than 23 BC, if it be assumed that Horace was alluding to this passage—and not developing, in his own fashion, ideas that were much in evidence in the entourage of Caesar Augustus in the early years of his rule. In any case, Horace's Ode is probably to be dated soon after 27 BC.⁶⁵

The notion is reflected in Livy, but palely, in a modified form. Camillus prevents his fellow-citizens from deserting Rome, laid desolate by the Gauls, and establishing themselves at Veii; and Camillus is honoured with the appellation of a second founder of Rome.⁶⁶

It is highly probable that Horace echoes Virgil. If not, at the very latest it is evidence that both poets derive from a common and august inspiration. The embargo on Troy is not universally recognised by the Augustan poets. Propertius supplies solid and convincing evidence. In the first poem of his fourth book, presumably composed after 20 BC, he more than once expatiates upon the theme of Troy renascent, reincarnate in Rome:

tunc animi venere Deci Brutique secures
vexit et ipsa sui Caesaris arma Venus,
arma resurgentis portans victricia Troiae!⁶⁷

[25] The poet upbraids the Greeks—vain is their victory, vain the device of the wooden horse, for Troy will live again.

vertite equum, Danaï! Male vincitis! Ilia tellus
vivat, et huic cineri Iuppiter arma dabit.⁶⁸

Lastly will be noted the lines, probably corrupt and out of place—

[23] dicam: Troia cades et Troica Roma resurges:
et maris et terrae longa sepulcra canam.⁶⁹

Virgil and Horace have heard the warning voice—but not Propertius.

To return to the three prophecies about Augustus. As it is recorded by Donatus that Virgil wrote his epic piecemeal, not in the order of the narrative, the ingenuity of scholarship is confronted by a great temptation—when and in what order were the different parts of the *Aeneid* composed? The divergence of the results that have been registered and published casts discredit on the methods and corroborates the argument for scepticism. Still, there is some

⁶⁵ In fact R. Heinze, 'Der Zyklus der Römeroden', *Neue Jahrbücher* 5 (1929), 675–87 = *Vom Geist des Römertums. Ausgewählte Aufsätze* (Leipzig and Berlin 1938) 213–34 at 230 [= (Darmstadt 1960³) 190–204 at 202] would date the poem very soon after the events of January, 27 BC. This is surely an excessive precision.

⁶⁶ Livy 5.49.7.

⁶⁷ Prop. 4.1.45–7.

⁶⁸ Prop. 4.1.53–4.

⁶⁹ Prop. 4.1.87–8. Note also 4.6.21, when Augustus is actually described as a Trojan Romulus—*Teucro damnata Quirino*.

justification for the attempt to date the passage mentioning Caesar Augustus: contemporary historical events provide a touchstone.

The *Prophecy of Jupiter* surely dates itself to 29 BC. It emphasises the Trojan descent of the young Caesar, and belongs to the period when Troy and Romulus were so much in evidence in official policy. Not so the *Revelation of Anchises* and the *Shield of Aeneas*. The latter is perhaps earlier in date than the former. As the Shield depicts the annals of Rome, from the she-wolf down to [26] the capture of the city by the Gauls, Romulus cannot help being prominent, just as in the parallel of Livy. But, in the central picture, that Battle of Actium, the young Caesar was leads to battle Rome and her gods:

Hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar
Cum patribus populoque penatibus et magnis dis.⁷⁰

owes little to Romulus or *Divus Julius*. Only the start of the Julian line is there,

patriumque aperitur vertice sidus.⁷¹

In the proem of the third book of the *Georgics*, presumably [24] composed in 30 or 29 BC, Virgil announced an intention of celebrating in verse the wars of Octavianus,

mox tamen ardentis accingar dicere pugnas
Caesaris, et nomen fama tot ferre per annos
Tithoni prima quot abest ab origine Caesar.⁷²

He quickly modified the proposal of an epic poem on contemporary history, adopting a subtler form of panegyric. The description of Actium may well belong to the earliest stratum of the *Aeneid*, perhaps even earlier than 27 BC: the name *Augustus* could easily have been inserted when that title was conferred [27] upon Octavianus in 27 BC. At least Propertius, in an elegy probably written not later than 26 BC, while clearly referring to the opening lines of the *Aeneid*, knows that the national epic will tell of Actium—

Actia Virgilium custodis litora Phoebi,
Caesaris et fortes dicere posse rates.⁷³

Latest in date is therefore the *Revelation of Anchises*. One portion, evidently, cannot be earlier than 23/22 BC, namely the panegyric of the young Marcellus,

⁷⁰ Virg. *Aen.* 8.678–79 [‘On one side was Augustus Caesar, leading the men of Italy into battle alongside the Senate and the People of Rome, its gods of home and its great gods’, trans. D. West].

⁷¹ Virg. *Aen.* 8.681 [‘his father’s star shone above his head’].

⁷² Virg. *Georg.* 3.46–48 [‘Yet anon I will gird me to sing Caesar’s fiery fights, and bear his name in story through as many years as Caesar is distant from the far-off birth of Tithonus’, trans. H. R. Fairclough].

⁷³ Prop. 2.34.61–2 [‘the pleasure of Virgil is to be able to sing the Actian shores over which Apollo watches, and the brave fleet of Caesar’, trans. G. P. Goold, modified].

which was recited in the presence of Augustus. Marcellus died in the second half of the year 23 BC, and, towards the end of 22 BC, Augustus departed from Rome to visit the eastern provinces. Moreover, as has been indicated above, the reference to the *Ludi Saeculares* points to 23 or 22 BC. It has therefore been argued by Norden and by others that the passage (*Aen.* 6.756–892) is in fact what it appears to be, an artistic whole: the episode in which the young Marcellus is honoured and bewailed is not a subsequent addition.⁷⁴ Certainty should not be attainable in such matters. It if was intended that the *Ludi Saeculares* should be celebrated in 23 or in 22 BC, that might well be known several years in advance by a person in close touch with the policy and the aspirations of the government. Nor is it conceivable that the author of a national epic had to delay before compiling a catalogue of the heroes of Roman history until the death of Marcellus provided the incentive. Virgil, it will be conceded, possessed the skill to cover up his tracks and combine passages that originally were separate. It could therefore just as well be argued that the greater [28] part of the *Revelation*, a theme of central import to the epic (and to Augustus), was composed as early as 25 or 24 BC, the lament for Marcellus being a later addition. If this is so, it is a fact of no small significance for the ‘ideology’ of the Principate of Caesar Augustus.

Anchises begins with a reference to the Trojan ancestry of the Romans,

nunc age Dardanium prolem quae deinde sequatur
gloria,⁷⁵

Apart from that, Troy is not emphasised; and it has been shown that the figure of Augustus is artfully removed from juxtaposition with Romulus by the insertion of a panegyric upon Rome. As for Caesar the Dictator, he is not only segregated from Caesar Augustus and from the *gens Julia*: he is consigned to anonymity, his conduct is heavily censured. It remains to investigate whether this treatment of the divine parent of Augustus is, or is not, a peculiar aberration of Virgil. A brief glance at other poets of the time will suffice to reveal the truth.

In the works of Horace the word *Caesar*, meaning Caesar the Dictator, occurs, twice, in contexts not admitting ambiguity: Augustus is described as *Caesaris ultor*,⁷⁶ and the *horti Caesaris* happen to be mentioned.⁷⁷ These references are casual and irrelevant to the poet’s view—or to anybody else’s view—of Caesar the Dictator. It is worth noting, however, that this designation of Octavianus as the avenger of Caesar comes in one of the earliest of Horace’s [29] *Odes*, before

⁷⁴ Cf. Norden’s commentary, 338.

⁷⁵ Virg. *Aen.* 6.756–7 [‘the glory that lies in store for the sons of Dardanus’, trans. D. West].

⁷⁶ Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.44. This poem is probably early in date (29 or 28 BC). The name ‘Augustus’ does not occur in it—he is referred to as *Caesar* in l. 52.

⁷⁷ Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.18.

27 BC. He does not revert to it subsequently. What Horace really thought is revealed by his silence about Julius Caesar as a person and as a character in history: in a list of Roman heroes, leading up to Augustus (modestly designated as vicegerent of Jupiter on earth), it is the star of the *gens Julia*, not a man, that is acclaimed, and, by being inserted between the Marcelli and Augustus, is shown to have little reference to Julius Caesar—

crescit occulto velut arbor aevo
fama Marcelli; micat inter omnis
Iulium sidus velut inter ignis
luna minores.⁷⁸

Here, as in Virgil's *Revelation of Anchises*, the line of Roman heroes terminates with the Marcelli—in relation to Augustus. Nor is there any ambiguity about the two places in Propertius where *Caesar* means *Divus Julius*—it is expressly the dead and deified Caesar.⁷⁹ That is to say, in Virgil, in Horace—and even in Propertius—Caesar has been drastically depersonalised.

Ovid, however, strikes a discordant note. Narrating at the end of the *Metamorphoses* the assumption of Julius Caesar into Heaven, he produces not a mere name or comet, but a genuine person:

[30] hic tamen accessit delubris advena nostris:
Caesar in Urbe sua deus est; quem Marte togaque
praecipuum non bella magis finita triumphis
resque domi gestae properataque gloria rerum
in sidus vertere novum stellamque comantem,
quam sua progenies; neque enim de Caesaris actis
ullum maius opus, quam quod pater exstitit huius.
Scilicet aequoreos plus est domuisse Britannos
perque papyriferi septemflua flumina Nili
victrices egisse rates Numidasque rebelles
Cinyphiumque Iubam Mithridateisque tumentem
nominibus Pontum populo adiecisse Quirini
et multos meruisse, aliquos egisse triumphos,
quam tantum genuisse virum? Quo praeside rerum
humano generi, superi, favistis abunde,
ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus,
ille deus faciendus erat.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.45–8 ['Like a tree that grows as time slips by, this is the fame of Marcellus: the Julian star shines in the midst of all others like the moon among smaller lights', trans. J. P. Clancy].

[6] ⁷⁹ Prop. 3.18.34; 4.6.59.

⁸⁰ Ov. *Met.* 15.745–61 ['Yet he, even so, had come from overseas/ to join our shrines; but Caesar is a god/ in his own city here. He was supreme/ in war and peace; though not his own campaigns/ triumphantly concluded, nor his feats/achieved at home, his glory gained so fast,/ made him a star, a comet new in heaven,/ rather his son. For nothing he achieved/ was greater

A remarkable passage. As has already been demonstrated, when the Augustan poets employ the word *Caesar*, they make it quite clear who they mean—failing contrary indication, it is always the living Caesar, *Divi filius*. Now Ovid's introduction of *Divus Julius* is ambiguous—*Caesar in urbe sua deus est*. The word *deus* was applied to Augustus by contemporary poets;⁸¹ and one would expect that the Caesar to whom Rome is *urbs sua* would be Augustus, not his parent. Ovid has been careless.

The real surprise is this—Ovid, alone among the poets of the age, provides a catalogue of the exploits of Julius Caesar as a conqueror in war. [31] He mentions Britain (but strangely, not Gaul) and certain episodes of the civil war, but only such as could be represented as victories against a foreign enemy. That is to say, not the Battle of Pharsalus and not the last effort of the Pompeian loyalists in Spain: instead, the fighting in Egypt, Pontus, and Africa. It is true that Ovid utilises the exploits of Caesar in order to shove in a gross chunk of flattery to the ruler of Rome. Caesar's greatest achievement, so Ovid avers, is the fact that he is the parent of Augustus—

neque enim de Caesaris actis
ullum maius opus, quam quod pater exstitit huius.
[‘For nothing Caesar achieved
was greater than to sire this son of his’]

Further, to secure for Augustus a more than mortal origin, it was necessary to deify his parent, Julius Caesar,

ne foret his igitur mortali semine cretus
ille deus faciendus erat.
[‘Lest therefore he be born of mortal seed,
his father must be made divine.’]

This was too true to be tactful; and, as will be shown, the link with Julius Caesar was less and less emphasised as the years passed, as Caesar's heir created, by service to Rome and the world, his peculiar and unprecedented claim to divinity. It might be doubted whether Augustus relished either the prominence accorded to the person of Julius Caesar or the compliment to himself.

than to sire this son of his./ To tame the Britons in their sea-girt isle./ to sail victorious up the seven-mouthed Nile/ where the papyrus blows, to annex for Rome/ Numidia's rebel tribesmen and their king./ Juba, and Pontus, bloated with the fame/ of mighty Mithridates, to exult/ in triumphs and deserve so many more—/ fine feats indeed, but how can they compare/ with being father of so fine an heir,/ under whose sovereignty mankind is given/ such plenteous blessings by the Powers of heaven?/ Lest therefore he be born of mortal seed,/ his father must be made divine', trans. A. D. Melville].

⁸¹ For example, Prop. 3.4.1: *arma deus Caesar dices meditatur ad Indos* [‘The god Caesar is planning war against the wealthy Indians’].

Ovid's conception is far from felicitous. He refuses to depersonalise Julius Caesar. Now the other poets derive from official sources of inspiration. [32] Propertius is not so near to the inner circle of government as Virgil or Horace, but even Propertius is significant. As for Virgil and Horace, they enjoy the friendship of Maecenas, chief minister of state for domestic affairs, and earn the confidence of the head of the government. Maecenas long ago had seen how poetry might be used to influence educated opinion at Rome. His choice and his patronage was splendidly remunerated: the best poets of the day give a true echo of official policy, sometimes clear and resonant, sometimes low and subtle.

Their treatment of Troy, of Romulus, and of Julius Caesar is consistent and instructive. The lesson of the poets was also enounced in prose. Livy's history is the counterpart of Virgil's epic—to him the long record of past struggles and past achievements culminates in the glory of the present, in the establishment of order and concord, in the Principate of Augustus Caesar. Now Livy, like Virgil, disapproved of Caesar the Dictator. He debated whether Caesar's birth was a blessing or a calamity;⁸² and such were his praises of Pompeius Magnus that Augustus called the historian a *Pompeianus*.⁸³ A sublime example, one might suppose, of enlightened tolerance. Not at all. The truth is not as simple as that.

Caesar's heir had gone through a long process of political evolution, from a military demagogue to a conservative statesman. His career opened in treason and violence—the raising of private armies, the march on Rome not once but twice, the proscriptions. To win the plebs and the veterans, the young man's claim was the name of Caesar—*o puer, qui omnia nomini debes*, as Marcus Antonius remarked.⁸⁴ It was Octavianus, not his rivals for power in the [33] Caesarian party, who pressed for deification of his parent, and exploited that advantage during the period of the Triumvirate. The military demagogue contended for primacy, invoking the Caesarian name against Antonius, whose following, by contrast, became more and more Republican and Pompeian. *Divi filius* prevailed: and for a time after Actium he is still the Caesarian leader, the new Romulus. But not for long. The revolution was over. Its chief author and the beneficiaries of that process in every order of society began to change their colour so as to conserve their gains.

The new order of things, or *novus status* as it was called, aimed at stability and respectability. An attempt was therefore made to disguise the unedifying origin of the regime, to pass over the twenty years of anarchy and return to the last generation of the Republic. Old names and forms came back—the *res publica* was restored to the Senate and People, for that was the phrase. Hence a certain rehabilitation of the champions, authentic or fraudulent, of 'liberty and the laws', especially Cato and Pompeius.⁸⁵ The defeated cause revived—and it was the 'better cause'. When asked what he thought of Cato, the Princeps

⁸² Sen. *NQ* 5.18.4.

⁸³ Tac. *Ann.* 4.34.

⁸⁴ Cic. *Phil.* 13.24.

⁸⁵ For the interpretation of this phenomenon, cf. Syme, *RR* 317–20, 506.

affirmed that anybody who tried to prevent the subversion of the law was a good citizen.⁸⁶ That was not his aim.

This meant no weakening, but only a consolidation of the rule of Caesar Augustus. Contemporaries were not taken in. Augustus' observation to the historian Livy was not intended as a reproach. Why, everybody was a Republican.

The enemies of Caesar are held in honour under the rule of his son and heir. The memory of the Dictator is suppressed. Caesar Augustus of course is *Divi filius*—he keeps the halo but resigns the rest of the compro[33a]mising heritage. Official documents confirm the discretion of the inspired literature. In legal or constitutional record there is no place for the Dictator—his rule was not a precedent but a warning. Nor, being *divus*, can he be honoured as an empire-builder. Hence a paradoxical result of depersonalisation—not Caesar's image but that of Pompeius Magnus is carried in the funeral procession of Caesar's son and heir. Even as *divus*, Caesar is treated shabbily. His name is not mentioned in the formulae of prayer used by the *Fratres Arvales*; and his representation is absent from dynastic monuments like the Vienna Cameo. So much for Caesar. [34] The exploitation of Romulus is also given up, for Augustus is not a military leader or tyrant—he is no longer *Dux*, but *Princeps*.⁸⁷

This is not the place to discuss the meaning of the 'constitutional settlement' of 27 BC, to demonstrate how and where the official version disguised or deified the facts. It is evident, however, that in political ideas a new current set in, rapidly. The most convincing document is Virgil. His allusions to Octavianus in the *Georgics* were incidental to the subject. Quite different the *Aeneid*. Nor merely are the three passages mentioning Augustus vital and organic—the whole theme, the allegory, is startling and contemporary.⁸⁸ Aeneas prevails in war, but victory does not mean conquest and domination. The Trojan leader may not build a new Troy in Italy; the alien name shall be abolished; and the defeated Latins will keep their language and their nationality. Nor is the triumph of Caesar's heir complete. Caesar has been avenged, that is enough. *Pietas* has been satisfied. Like Aeneas, the young Caesar must change, turning toward the vanquished cause—liberty and the laws, Cato and the Republic; he must abandon, or at least abate, earlier allegiances and un-Roman practices; though a military leader, and victorious, he brings not despotism but concord—*nec mihi regna peto*.

Those who attempt to shape and guide public opinion, where public opinion exists in however rudimentary a form, understand the value of verbal antithesis. The simpler the better. Inherent in all the political propaganda of the Roman Empire from Augustus onwards is the facile contrast between

⁸⁶ Macrob. *Sat.* 2.4.18; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 85.1.

⁸⁷ For *dux* as applied to Augustus, cf. the examples quoted in Syme, *RR* 311–12. Ovid (*Fast.* 2.60) even calls him *dux sacratus*.

⁸⁸ Syme, *RR* 462–3.

despotism and constitutional government, between *dominatus* and *principatus*.⁸⁹ Caesar the Dictator is the type of the one, Augustus the Princeps of the other. The terms in which Ovid, addressing Romulus, opposes him to Augustus, will suitably be applied to the antithetic figures of the Dictator and the Princeps—

vis tibi grata fuit, florent aut Caesare leges:
tu domini nomen, principis ille tenet.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ Plin. *Pan.* 43.3: *sunt diversa natura dominatio et principatus* ['dominion and principate are different in nature'].

⁹⁰ Ov. *Fast.* 2.141–2 ['To you violence was welcome; under Caesar the law flourishes. You have the name of master; he has the name of *princeps*', trans. A. and P. Wiseman].

How Many *Fasces*?

[1] The understanding of Roman public law is hedged and hampered by many obstacles. The Romans themselves are largely to blame, that people whose peculiar glory is law and government. They were not explicit enough, they failed to produce a proper code and doctrine. Not only that: a deplorable lack of interest, so it appears. Eminent masters of jurisprudence are on parade in the last century of the Republic: consuls and censors, the first men of the State. For all their science, and despite rank and quality, they betray few signs of a preoccupation with constitutional law.

A paradox. Where is the reason to be sought? A modern exponent of the discipline (one of the most sober and precise) supplies an answer—‘the subject had little attraction for jurists because the last 150 years of the Republic was occupied by a continuous constitutional crisis’.¹ The explanation turns out to be more a paradox than was the problem. On the face of things, and by analogy with the behaviour of other ages, a constitutional crisis would be sheer delight for the lawyers (scholarship, ambition, or partisan spirit); and politicians ought to have turned to the lawyers for guidance when they required a precedent from the past, the sanctions of a valid principle—or some crafty and plausible artifice.

* * *

The efforts of the jurists, great and small, were spent in another field, Roman private law: notably possession and property, goods, and inheritance. The *res publica* was not their normal and congenial province. Constitutional practice at Rome exhibits a double nature. First, ancient ritual. Many of the provisions about magistracies and government went back to a time long anterior to the emergence of any distinction between sacred and profane: the transmission of the *imperium*, the *auspicia*, the *lex curiata*. Secondly, where an exact ritual did not obtain, custom and precedent were held valid—and the Romans were skilful in interpreting or circumventing any prescription. [2] Ancestral tradition was invoked, the *mos maiorum*. Never to be lightly held, even if the

¹ F. Schultz, *History of Roman Legal Science* (Oxford 1946) 81.

venerable precedents might prove to be quite recent in origin, even if in practice old custom corresponded with something that would not disturb and alarm the oldest senator of consular rank.

Where then will the experts be discovered? The answer is not far to seek—it derives from the dual character of the Roman constitution. First, the men who knew the ancient rituals. The patricians had once held the monopoly of *ius divinum humanumque*. Although the political predominance of the order had been broken long ago, the patrician *gentes* did not forget tradition or forfeit their ambitions. Sulla the Dictator was eager to reinstate the patriciate as a necessary part and member of the *res publica*. There was a patent justification—some priesthoods could be held only by patricians, and it was desirable to keep up the regular proportion with plebeians in the great sacerdotal colleges. Augurs were in especial demand, to approve or invalidate the operations of magistrates, and the old learning found assiduous devotees. Three consular augurs of patrician stock wrote disquisitions about their art—L. Caesar, Ap. Claudius Pulcher, and M. Messalla.² Nor is any portrayal of Julius Caesar adequate, *pontifex* and *pontifex maximus*, if it neglects his interest in the traditional religion, his pedantic insistence on ritual observances.

Secondly, the men who know precedents and procedure, having held magistracies, guided the high assembly by counsel, and accumulated weight and wisdom. The ex-consul carries *auctoritas* as an individual, and the *consulares* as a body can be convoked by a magistrate to give informal evidence.³

In a normal season as many as twenty-five ex-consuls might be available. If, however, the consulars are few in number or deficient in prestige, a senator of lower rank has a chance. That happened in the decade after Sulla's restoration of the oligarchy. Of the consulars extant when he resigned the dictatorship, only four find mention in the record of subsequent years. Hence the emergence of a certain [3] Cornelius Cethegus. According to Cicero, this man knew the *res publica* inside out, and he had acquired the kind of authority that belongs to a *consularis*.⁴ Another passage, presenting Cethegus in a less favourable light, discloses his aptitude in the science of politics and the management of patronage—the highest in the land courted his favour and visited his house after nightfall.⁵ Cicero is referring to the consul Lucullus, who, desiring Cilicia as his province, had to conciliate Cethegus, to which end he applied to a lady called Praecia, the mistress of Cethegus.⁶

The hand of Cethegus can be seen or surmised in other transactions in or about the year 74: he was instrumental in getting a special command against the Pirates for the praetor M. Antonius. Cethegus, once an adherent of Marius

² Cass. Dio 37.27; Gell. 13.15. W. W. Fowler, *Roman Essays and Interpretations* (London 1920) 138.

³ Cic. *Balb.* 45.

⁴ Cic. *Brut.* 178.

⁵ Cic. *Part.* 5.40.

⁶ Plut. *Luc.* 5–6.

and declared a public enemy, yet preserved in the end by Sulla, is not a man to be missed.⁷

When politicians or priests are the authorities on constitutional propriety, a man had better be on his guard. The conduct and operations of experts like Cethegus, or, for that matter, the patrician Ap. Claudius Pulcher (*cos.* 54), are enough to cause disquiet, whatever arguments they may have based upon *mos maiorum* or sacerdotal law.

In the last epoch of the Roman Republic, the *lex curiata* comes into novel prominence, that enactment of a primeval assembly deemed requisite before an elected holder of *imperium* is qualified to exercise command in war. The origin of the *lex curiata* is perhaps less mysterious than its subsequent history—or lack of history—in the annalistic record of the Republic. One might be tempted to wonder whether the observance had not been rescued from long neglect by Sulla the Dictator—or perhaps rediscovered a few years later by some scholarly expert in ritual.

The *lex curiata* crops up several times as a weapon of political warfare. Ap. Pulcher was blocked by his enemies, but none the less went out to his province of Cilicia without the passing of the *lex curiata*. He declared that it was right and proper, but not indispensable. Ap. Pulcher was an augur—and an astute politician.⁸

[4] What weight and credence shall therefore be assigned to the pronouncements of other politicians concerning Roman public law or practice? For example, the duties, powers, and prerogatives of a consul.

The two consuls are the supreme executive of the Republic, in theory omnicompetent. Time, custom, and the creation of diverse, precise, and allocated departments (*provinciae*) circumscribed their prerogative. Cicero, it is true, comes out with a firm asseveration.⁹ All provinces ought to be under the authority and jurisdiction of a consul. The text and context of the orator's pronouncement must be quietly scrutinised. He is arguing Antonius' claim to the province of Gallia Cisalpina, a claim (be it noted) that depended upon a *lex*, clear and explicit. The province offered resistance to Antonius. The province, says Cicero, was right. This action demonstrated that Antonius was not a genuine consul.

Again, another statement of Cicero, in a matter not quite so obnubilated with sophisticated pleas: the position of the consuls of 49, who had left Rome with Pompeius Magnus and most of the Senate. Cicero affirms that, according to the *mos maiorum*, it is permitted to go to each or any of the provinces.¹⁰

⁷ Greenidge and Clay, *Sources for Roman History 133–70 BC* (Oxford 1960²) 255.

⁸ Cic. *Fam.* 8.9; W. W. How, *Cicero. Select Letters*, II, *Notes* (Oxford 1926) ep. 25 n. 25, p. 234–6, Notes. E. S. Staveley, 'The Constitution of the Roman Republic, 140–1954', *Historia* 5 (1956), 74–122, at 84; J. J. Nicholls, 'The Content of the *Lex Curiata*', *AJP* 88 (1967), 257–78, at 264–6.

⁹ Cic. *Phil.* 4.9.

¹⁰ Cic. *Att.* 8.15.3.

Caution is requisite in interpreting this statement. The Roman government would not be precluded (it is clear) from employing a consul anywhere, due formalities being observed and no law infringed. It does not follow that a consul could go to any province as and when he pleased, interfering with the holder of *imperium* in a definite and allocated *provincia*. Indeed, if the Senate wished thus to employ and empower a consul, it might well stand in need of more than a *senatus consultum*: a *lex* might have to be abrogated. Otherwise the problem of superseding Caesar the proconsul of Gaul would have been simple indeed. However, that situation was dominated by other factors than procedure and the proprieties ...

Such is the nature of the ancient authorities about public law, reticent or incurious when they are not flagrantly dishonest. The modern age has compensated in more than ample measure. Mommsen [5] intervened with imperious genius to ordain and codify the observances of the Roman Republic. His *Staatsrecht* stands as a classic achievement, an enduring monument. The *epigoni* concur and follow—and want to go further. Hence refinements of doctrine, or baroque elaborations. There has been produced, for example, a type of *imperium* that carried military command but no civil authority. Such, it is alleged, was the *imperium* exercised by Pompeius Magnus in certain of the eastern provinces when he waged war against Mithridates. The facts confute. Magnus had the provinces of Cilicia and Bithynia, and he bore the title of proconsul. Apart from those known but neglected facts, the doctrine went astray. Nothing of the sort was attested in any document, or imaginable to the Romans. In their conception, *imperium* is solid, unitary, indivisible, modified only by the rank of its holder and the sphere of its exercise.

There is a further consequence. Not only has an enormous weight of scholarship and argument been brought to bear upon the problem of the legal powers of Caesar Augustus in the Roman Commonwealth. Different types of *imperium* (with pseudo-technical terms) have been conjured up. One of them, *imperium infinitum*, can easily be disposed of; and the whole notion of *imperium maius*, as utilised by modern scholars, can be shown to be vitiated by misconceptions.¹¹ The discussion goes on. Perhaps it could never end—is it certain that all the participants want it to end?

Modern doctrines can be arid, perverse, intolerable. From their complications and contortions it is time to revert to Rome and the Romans. There is a neglected aspect of *imperium*, the visible and vestimentary.

The *fascēs* are the embodiment of *imperium*. Who could not be shaken by the sight of the rods and axes, the splendor of power and the terror? As the poet Lucretius puts it, *pulchros fascēs saevasque securēs*.¹² Authority was meant to inspire fear.

¹¹ J. Béranger, *Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du Principat* (Basle 1953) 74–96.

¹² Lucr. [5.1234].

[6] The Romans had a high sense of pageantry in their public life: procession and sacrifice, the triumphal ceremony, or the obsequies of some great man. Nothing could surpass a consul going to war. Livy, describing the exit of P. Crassus in 171, is equal to the occasion, with apposite remarks about the majesty of the spectacle, the emotions of the bystanders, with solemn reflections on fame and power and the vicissitudes of warfare.¹³ The consul, crossing the sacred precinct of the city, put on the red cloak of war. He went out *paludatus* and his lictors added axes to the bundles of the rods. Outside the *pomerium* and now in the sphere *militiae*, the consul of the Roman People exercised the full *imperium*, untrammelled, and paraded like a king.

That was right and proper. The standard tradition of the Romans derived the consular authority in direct and immediate sequence from the Kings of Rome. There is no voice or hint of discordance. The *fasces* are precisely the *insignia imperii*, transmitted from kings to consuls; and the total of *fasces* shows how much *imperium* anybody has. *Imperium* is not a concept which the Romans ever bothered to define. Its quantity depends on who holds it, its quality on the field in which it is exercised.

The king of Rome had twelve *fasces* for his *insignia*. What happened when the monarchy was abolished? The explanation is consistent, though there are variant versions, the heroic figures of Junius Brutus and Valerius Poplicola competing. According to Livy, Brutus, the first consul of the Republic, introduced alternation in tenure of the *fasces* between the two consuls.¹⁴ Otherwise, each with twelve, there would have been a *duplicatus terror*. Cicero furnished a similar explanation, but expanded: twenty-four *fasces*, that is to say, more than under the monarchy, would be inconceivable in a republic.¹⁵

The first year of the Roman Republic witnessed another change. Livy duly registers it. Appeal from the holders of *imperium* was instituted in the city, that is, *provocatio*, with a consequent separation of the spheres *domi* and *militiae*. But Livy (as is characteristic for that author) forgets to report any repercussion of the change on the consular *insignia imperii*. Other authorities are precise. The axes were taken from the *fasces*.

[7] One of those authorities (and only one) expounds a clear and coherent doctrine about the *fasces*. Not a Roman annalist but a Greek antiquarian, Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In the first year of the Republic he carefully distinguishes two stages.¹⁶ First, alternation in the *fasces*. Secondly, abolition of axes in the city.

His testimony about the first stage is precious and deserves to be exploited. One consul each month had the twelve *fasces*. His colleague had only twelve attendants, bearing staves, or as some say, clubs also.

¹³ Livy 42.49.

¹⁴ Livy 2.1.

¹⁵ Cic. *Rep.* 2.55.

¹⁶ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.2.19.

What Dionysius reports is comprehensible. No drawback but an advantage if he reflects the practice in a later age. The true *fascēs* were a bundle of rods, tied together, as it is stated in the ancient sources and is abundantly confirmed by the monumental evidence. There were other and inferior emblems of authority. Municipal magistrates were not entitled to real *fascēs*, even though such may be paraded on their tombs. Instead, their attendants carried staves, or *bacilli*. Further, an odd item reveals something about *bacilli*. When Cicero after the campaign of Pharsalus returned to Italy and spent some time at Brundisium, still invested with the *imperium* of his Cilician proconsulate, he was anxious not to attract too much notice but unwilling to forego his lictors.¹⁷ A prudent compromise furnished them with *bacilli*.

Lictors could be assigned to persons not in possession of the *imperium*. Thus one to each of the Vestal Virgins by an enactment of the Triumvirs in 42 BC. Certain public monuments at Rome show the Virgins and their attendants, for example Frieze B of the Domitianic reliefs found near the Palazzo della Cancelleria. The attendant has two long parallel staves on his left shoulder.

Dionysius attests a fact. The lictors of the consul *quem penes fascēs non essent* ['under whose charge the *fascēs* were not'] carried something other than *fascēs* as an emblem of authority or rank, resembling (if not identical with) the staves attested for the attendants of the Virgins. The theory and purpose of rotation in the twelve *fascēs* is clear and unimpeachable. It comes out, if that [8] were necessary, in the story of the Decemvirs. The first board was proper and legitimate—alternating the twelve *fascēs* month by month. The second was tyrannical and exorbitant—twelve *fascēs* each.

To be the consul who opened the year with the *fascēs* carried prestige—and (it can be surmised) various advantages. Roman antiquarian writers register and discuss the terms *consul maior* and *consul prior*. Not all of them are alert or satisfactory in their interpretations. There is a way out. It can be taken that the consul who was the first to be elected enjoyed as the privilege the first tenure of the twelve *fascēs*. That privilege, it can further be contended, was the rule all through until 18 when the *Leges Juliae* transferred it to the consul who had the greater number of children.¹⁸

Such, in brief, was the rotation of the *fascēs*—in theory from the first year of the Republic. There was no cause ever for it to be abrogated.

Mommsen (it is true) assumed that the practice fell into desuetude (how and when and why, he did not explain). Most scholars concur, without enquiry. The primary text is Suetonius in his *Vita Caesaris*—incorrectly interpreted by Mommsen and by others in the sequel.¹⁹ Suetonius reports what Caesar did in his first consulate. Caesar, he says, brought back the *antiquus mos*. In any month when he did not have the *fascēs* he insisted that

¹⁷ Cic. *Att.* 11.6.2.

¹⁸ [Gell. 2.15.4–7.]

¹⁹ Suet. *DJ* 20.

the lictors should walk behind him, that only an attendant (an *accensus*) should precede. What Caesar did is clear—and not at all important. Pedantic in his insistence on tradition, he corrected a minor abuse that had grown up, namely lictors preceding a consul in the months when he had no rights to the *fasces*.

That consul had twelve lictors, but not the twelve *fasces*. Now lictors could be assigned to persons other than the holders of *imperium* at Rome. For example, the Vestal Virgins. What matters is not the lictors but the emblems they carried.

The consul *penes quem fasces essent* was preceded by twelve lictors with the *insignia imperii*. What of the twelve lictors of his colleague, [9] who walked behind him when the proprieties were observed? They carried rods or staves of some kind, clearly distinguishable on sight from the twelve *fasces*. Dionysius, describing the rotation of the *fasces* in the first year of the Republic, draws a clear distinction between genuine and symbolic *fasces*. And, as will in due course be shown, that distinction remains valid and can prove instructive.

To resume, and go back. The total of *fasces* indicates the quantity of *imperium* a man has. There could never be any doubt and dispute. In title and in fact, a proconsul is the exact equivalent of a consul (though only in the sphere of *militiae*, for he cannot exist in the city).²⁰ Therefore he has twelve *fasces*. Similarly, six for a praetor: exactly half of a consul. And, consequently, six for a *pro praetore*. Whatever may have been the Roman nomenclature of the holders of *imperium* with whom the Greeks first came into contact, they tended to call them praetors (στρατηγοί). More revealing for the sight and impact of power, they call the Roman praetor or commander a ‘six-axe man’ (ἑξαπέλεκυς).

A further consequence. Subordinate holders of *imperium* emerge in the last age of the Republic, bearing the title *legati pro praetore*. Not, as is often and uncritically assumed, as the subordinates of Pompeius Magnus in his *extraordinaria imperia*: one is attested under Lucullus.²¹ Such *legati* are the predecessors of the *legati* whom Caesar Augustus uses to govern the different parts of the *provincia*. There is a relevant question: to how many *fasces* is a *legatus pro praetore* entitled? No precise statement is available. None the less, the position is clear: a man either was, or was not, a subordinate. An item related by Cicero is instructive. Curio in 49 appeared with six *fasces*. Correct, if he was praetor or *pro praetore*. But his *fasces* were adorned with laurels, those of Caesar, the victorious proconsul of Gaul. Therefore (Cicero means to convey) he was only *legatus*, therefore not entitled to six *fasces*. It follows that a *legatus pro praetore* had fewer than six. How many, therefore? Five, it can be

²⁰ Staveley, ‘Constitution’, 63.

²¹ [C. Salluvius Naso: *ILS* 37, with *RE* s. 2, I A 2, col. 1975–6, no. 1.] Or earlier: cf. Hirrus [who served under M. Antonius in 102 BC (*CIL* 1².2.2662).]

conjectured, for the [10] *legati pro praetore* under Caesar Augustus have five, whatever their rank: not only ex-praetors but ex-consuls.

So far the necessary subordination, namely fewer than six *fascēs*. The rôle and function of the twelve *fascēs* is clear. What of a number larger than twelve? The appointment of a dictator overrode (but could not abolish) the normal prerogatives of Senate, People, and magistrates. According to Polybius, he had twenty-four *fascēs*.²² There might be a doubt whether the dictator carried that total within the city. However that may be, the sources indicate that twenty-four was regarded as right and proper for Sulla, for Caesar, or for Caesar Augustus.

* * *

A law of the consul M. Antonius abolished the dictatorship for ever. But dictatorial powers were revived, before twenty months had elapsed when the Triumvirate was instituted by the *Lex Titia* of November 27, 43. Caesar's tenure of absolutism had been brief in duration. The despotic rule of the Triumvir, Caesar's heir, lasted a decade by letter of the law, but in fact (it seemed, and it can be claimed so) for a longer period, for fifteen years. In spite of any official proclamations, what this government achieved could not be reversed entirely and brought to nothing.

To define the powers of the Triumvirs might seem otiose. Their very title avowed the supersession of the sovereignty of Senate and People, for it was their precise function to bring it into being. They were *IIIviri rei publicae constituendae*. Nor, indeed, has much speculation been lavished on their powers and prerogatives. In one matter, however, speculation is not frivolous, and may turn out to be profitable in more ways than one: the Triumvirs' mandate rested upon a law. How was that law formulated?

First, the limit in time. As can without discomfort be assumed for each and all of the *extraordinaria imperia* of the late Republic, a term was fixed at which the *imperium* expired. The length of such commands was [11] commonly (and loosely) described as a number of years (thus three or most commonly five), but it was manifest good sense that the phraseology of a law would be more precise. The *Lex Titia* ordains a day, the day previous to the sixth Kalends of January thence ensuing (i.e., January 1, 37).

The day came and went. Nothing happened. The Triumvirs were not incommoded or alarmed. In the course of the year, however, their position was regularised, their powers renewed for a second *quinquennium*. What was the new terminal date—the end of 33 or the end of 32? The evidence is conflicting—and, despite the lengthy controversies of the learned, no great importance should be accorded to the problem. Or rather perhaps to the two problems: the legal date and the date at which Octavianus resigned his powers. As concerns the former, a possibility of some interest arises. If in 37 the

²² [Plb. 3.87.7.]

Triumvirs simply proposed to add a full and precise *quinquennium* of sixty months, with retrospective inclusion from the expiry of their powers on the last day of 38, the resulting date would be the last day of 33. But if, however, the *Lex Titia* was re-enacted word for word, then ‘the day previous to the sixth Kalends of January ensuing’ is the last day of 32. And, let it be added as an independent supporting argument, Octavianus and Antonius were to hold the consulate together in 31. However that may be, certain phenomena suggest that Octavianus resigned at the beginning of 32. Consuls and a tribune suddenly come to matter.

Secondly, and of strict relevance to the present inquiry: the powers laid down by the *Lex Titia*. Only one of the written sources attempts any definition of the Triumvirate. Appian says that it was ‘a new species of authority equal in power to the consuls’.²³ What term of Latin lurks behind the Greek? It would not be rash to assume that it was *imperium consulare*. A valuable consequence emerges. The Triumvirs had twelve *fascēs* each—all the time, not passing by alternation, for this was not a Republic. Twelve, not twenty-four—that number would advertise what they were in fact, each a dictator. That would avoid the connotations of that name and title.

* * *

[12] Octavianus, no longer Triumvir, was duly elected consul for 31, and there ensues the sequence of his consulships in an unbroken run down to the eleventh. In that period falls the ‘Restoration of the Republic’. Can that momentous transaction be dated? The first response is a triumphant affirmative—the proclamation made to the Senate on January 13, 27, with, three days later, the vote of the *cognomen* ‘Augustus’.

That, however, was only the termination of a process. According to Augustus himself, the operation was conducted ‘in my sixth and seventh consulships’.²⁴ Further, and on no count to be neglected, the historian Tacitus. Bringing to a suitable conclusion his excursus on legislation in Book III of the *Annals*, he puts the emphasis on the sixth consulship as the year that witnessed the legal establishment of the new order—*deditque iura quis pace et princeps frueremur*.²⁵

These indications should be followed up. It is a question worth asking, how and when Caesar’s heir made it plain and visible to men that ‘normal government’ was back—or at least firmly on the way. Cassius Dio furnishes an answer. Introducing the year 28, he states that the young Caesar ‘handed over the bundles of rods to his colleague Agrippa, according to prescription, while he himself used the others’.²⁶

²³ App. [BC 4.7: *καὶνὴν ἀρχὴν ... ἴσον ἰσχύουσιν ὑπάτοις*].

²⁴ RG [34.1].

²⁵ [Tac. *Ann.* 3.28.2: ‘whereby we could avail ourselves of peace and a *princeps*’.]

²⁶ [Cass. Dio 53.1.1: *καὶ τοὺς φακέλους τῶν ῥάβδων τῷ Ἀγρίππᾳ συνάρχοντί οἱ κατὰ τὸ ἐπιβάλλον παρέδωκεν, αὐτὸς τε ταῖς ἑτέραις ἐχρήσατο.*]

The interpretation ought to be clear and easy. Mommsen took it that Octavianus who had previously (he assumed) been bearing twenty-four *fasces* now divided them with his colleague, twelve each. Most scholars have been content to reproduce this view.²⁷ It does violence to the testimony of Dio. That author is referring to the rotation of the consular *fasces*. He confesses, it is true, to some surprise and perplexity: he is not certain whether Augustus subsequently behaved in this manner, and he adduces his great admiration for Agrippa. That can pass. Dio's comments do not invalidate the fact that Dio reports. Therefore, it can be argued, the first stage in the 'Restoration of the Republic' is disclosed, a date and even a day: the twelve *fasces* duly transferred to Agrippa on February 1, 28.

[13] There is something else. Dio attests two kinds of emblems, 'The bundles of the rods' and 'the others'.²⁸ The first are the consular twelve, the second visibly different. One recalls Dionysius on the first year of the Republic: the lictors of the consuls who did not have the *fasces* carried some kind of clubs or staves. Further (compare above) the staves carried by the official attendants of the persons lacking the *imperium*, such as Vestal Virgins or municipal magistrates.

That is not all. The transference of the twelve *fasces* early in 28, being a fact that passed into the historical record, conveyed by the source of Cassius Dio, it follows that the practice had not obtained the year before. The victor of Actium returned to hold his triple triumph, celebrated in August of 29. His colleague for the latter part of the year was Potitus Valerius Messalla. That colleague therefore did not enjoy the twelve consular *fasces* by rotation.

Caesar's heir had the monopoly of the *insignia*. And why not? As the author of the *Res Gestae* avows, the *res publica* was in his possession, for in 28 and 27 he transferred it *ex mea potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium*. Similarly Tacitus—Octavianus was *potentiae securus* in 28.²⁹

Another avowal of the *princeps* is instructive. After bringing back normal government (he says), he had more *auctoritas* than anybody else, but no more *potestas* than his colleagues in any given magistracy—*quoque in magistratu* (RG 34.3). The passage comports several difficulties. Not to enlarge or digress, let it be taken that the consulate is the only magistracy in which Augustus had colleagues—and let it further be noted that the assertion ceases to be valid after the year 23 (except for the sporadic tenures of 5 and 2). Now in the system of the Roman Republic it is inconceivable that a consul can have more *potestas* than his colleague. Why therefore deny the inconceivable—unless because recently, the *res publica* being in suspension, a consul had in fact been in that position?

²⁷ W. W. Tarn-M. P. Charlesworth, 'The Triumph of Octavian', in *CAH X* (Cambridge 1934) 112–26, at 123.

²⁸ [Cass. Dio 53.1.1: τοὺς φακέλους τῶν ῥάβδων... ταῖς ἐτέραις.]

²⁹ [RG 34.1; Tac. *Ann.* 3.28.3.]

[14] After Actium and the reconquest of the East for Rome, Caesar's heir was in possession of sovereign power—*potitus rerum omnium*—another admission, artfully balanced by *per consensum universorum*. The new Romulus was in truth a monarch. In so far as constitutional forms and language had any force and meaning, he could be said to base his predominance on the consulate. It was no ordinary consulship. Rather a continuation of Triumviral absolutism.

In governing their dominions, the Triumvirs employed both proconsuls and *legati*. The proconsuls were permitted to take imperatorial salutations and celebrate triumphs. But they could be treated as little better than *legati*, as two incidents in the year 38 demonstrate. For the victories of Ventidius a triumph was voted to Antonius and his general, and Antonius took a third imperatorial acclamation. Similarly the *imp. III* of Octavianus presumably derives from the exploits of Agrippa in Gaul: Agrippa is recorded as refusing a triumph.³⁰

In no other instance was this practice adopted when proconsuls under the Triumvirate earned or celebrated triumphs. It emerges, however, in two items of the year 29 reported by Cassius Dio. The historian in a not very clear statement shows Octavianus in his triple triumph annexing the credit for victories of C. Carrinas in Gaul. Next, triumphs were voted both to M. Licinius Crassus for his victories in Macedonia and Thrace, and to Octavianus. Dio subjoins a note: according to some authorities, Crassus did not take the imperial salutation, but it was added to Octavianus' total.

The latter version seems to be correct, in one particular at least for *imp. VII* joins the ruler's total in 29: Actium furnished the sixth acclamation. On the other hand, there had been no similar consequence of Carrinas' victories; and there was to be none in the sequel.

To take over the imperatorial acclamation of a proconsul is a plain claim to an overriding *imperium*. The corollary should have [15] been (one would expect) denial of the right of triumph. Crassus held his celebration in 27 (as Carrinas had in 28). The holders of power are not bound to consistency when they interpret law and religion to their own advantage.

It will not therefore with safety be assumed that Caesar's heir was proposing in 29 to enforce rigidly a doctrine about imperatorial salutations that had only twice been applied during the Triumvirate. Otherwise there might be a temptation to exploit the evidence of the triumphs of C. Calvisius Sabinus and L. Autronius Paetus (in May and September of 28): it could be supposed that their claims for a triumph did not reach Rome before the first day of February, 28.

That day (so it has been argued above) saw the consulate revert to its normal and traditional functions, by a visible sign when the twelve *fasces* passed to

³⁰ [Cass. Dio 54.11.6.]

M. Agrippa; there were no consular *suffecti* (for the first time since 40); and the integral restoration of normal government was proclaimed on January 13, 27.

The Triumvirs appointed consuls, naming them for long years in advance. That did not mean the proper ceremonial on the Campus was dispensed with. When the *res publica* came back, free elections returned. Inevitably, and at least in semblance. It was necessary, however, to safeguard the Republic from any excesses or illusions of liberty regained. That is to say, Caesar Augustus had a plain duty to keep a tight grasp on the consulate. He was duly elected, year after year. The identity of the colleagues elected in the first years of the new dispensation is a guarantee. For 27, M. Agrippa again (now for the third time), for 26 T. Statilius Taurus (for the second time) next in power to Agrippa. By these men, and by C. Maecenas (who held no office), Rome was governed during the three years of the *princeps*' absence in the western lands (27–4). None of them (not the marshals, and not the equestrian diplomat) had any familiarity [16] with the traditions of *Senatus Populusque Romanus*, with the procedure of the Curia. There is no trace of free and open competition for the consulate, of public disturbances, or of legal and constitutional disputes.³¹

The two consuls (it must again be emphasised) are the supreme executive magistrates of the Roman People; and consular prerogative could be stretched a long way without the need to invoke the name or notion of a consular *imperium maius*. It depends upon the circumstances—who does the interpreting, and who will criticise, refute, or resist.

What interpretation Caesar Augustus put upon his consular authority in the period from 28 to 23, and how far he strained it, the evidence does not enable it to be divined, still less stated. But this much can be said. When the consulate has been exercised in a monarchic fashion by the same person for years without a break, it may take more than rotation of the twelve *fascēs* and governmental proclamations to bring back to normal and Republican compass, either in its operations or in the beliefs of men. As far as theory went, that person could not have any more *potestas* than his colleague at any given time. But there are the facts of power, and emanation of power: that is to say, *auctoritas*, the other name of which is *potentia*.

Tacitus in the second chapter of Book I operates most insidiously. Caesar's heir, he says, had given up the name and title of Triumvir and professed to be no more than a consul.³² Further, Tacitus makes no distinction between the ruler's consulships before and after the ostensible changes in 28 and 27. No allusion whatsoever to the 'Restoration of the Republic'—and none, except

³¹ Unless M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus decided to resign the office of *praefectus urbi* in 26 BC after a mere few days because he regarded it as an unconstitutional magistracy: Tac. *Ann.* 6.11.3; Jer. *Chron.* s.a. 26 BC.

³² [Tac. *Ann.* 1.2.1.]

veiled, to any subsequent modifications. Nor is there any notion of a surrender of power. The historian's theme is the inevitable consolidation of the imperial authority, the reasons briefly indicated. Perhaps he is less remote from the truth than are his critics.

Ushering in 'normal government' for his own manifest convenience, the ruler decided that he would be elected consul each year. It did [17] not require much thought, it was the ready expedient. Before long, various discomforts would emerge, even if they could not have been predicted.

A crisis occurred in the first half of the year 23 BC—genuine and political, not merely constitutional. Augustus gave up the consulate. He kept however, the vast *provincia* voted for ten years in 27 BC, and he kept the *imperium* over that *provincia*, with express permission to retain it in the city of Rome; and, further, that *imperium* was expressly defined as superior to the authority of any provincial governor. From now on Caesar Augustus could (and indeed should) have borne the title *proconsul*. He chose not to, for good reasons. Further, as a source of authority in Rome, he now laid emphasis on tribunician powers.

* * *

The next four years exhibit, by various signs, a deliberate relaxation of governmental control, and the ruler was absent for most of the time. It was only an interlude.

Augustus, who was governing the greater part of the armed provinces, had, and could have, no *insignia* in the city of Rome. Given the history of the last twenty-five years—dictatorship, Triumvirate, and consulate in sequence—that was anomalous for the head of the Roman government. In the course of the year 22 BC he was offered the consulate, to be held every year, without a break, and the dictatorship. According to Cassius Dio, the Roman mob besieged the *princeps*, presenting him with the twenty-four *fasces*.³³ Where they got the objects is not stated. Perhaps, as had happened precisely thirty years before, loyal and zealous citizens looted the grove of Libitina and carried off the emblems used for state funerals.³⁴

It was natural (not in every way expedient) that the holder of authority like that of Augustus should be seen by all men with something at least of the pageantry and vestment of power that Rome had known from the beginning. Furthermore, would it not be clear advantage for Caesar Augustus, having resigned the name and title of [18] consul, to get back the consular *insignia*—and perhaps the power also and the prerogatives, whether openly by legal enactment, or unobtrusively?

Power but not office, that is one of the earliest of the *arcana imperii*. Firmly and nobly refusing to be called consul in perpetuity, still less dictator, why should not Augustus engross the authority of the consuls? *Imperium consulare*

³³ [Cass. Dio 54.1.3.]

³⁴ Asconius [33.13 C.].

could be used (and be useful) for all manner of operations. If it were not somewhere attested, it might have to be invented.³⁵

Cassius Dio under the year 19 BC registers a grant of consular powers. Mommsen impatiently rejected it as fraud and figment—*totum ficticium*.³⁶ Perhaps he was wrong. The notice has been acclaimed with joy and alacrity from time to time. Here of a truth was the coping-stone of the arch, the key and clue to the Constitution of the Principate (as it is called).³⁷

The context in Dio needs to be carefully scrutinised. Not only (according to Dio) did Augustus acquire consular authority, and for life. He was voted to the office of *curator morum* for five years, and he in fact assumed the powers of a censor for that period. In this matter the author is compressed or confused. Either of those two attributes would occlude the other. That is not the worst. Augustus in the *Res Gestae* affirms that he rejected such a grant, not only in 19 BC, but on two subsequent occasions.

Those who accept an *imperium consulare* on the authority of Cassius Dio must know what they do since at the same time they reject (all, or almost all) the other item in Dio, namely censorial powers (however and by what title formulated).

Consulare imperium further stands in conflict with an explicit asseveration of Caesar Augustus. On two occasions he held a census *consulari cum imperio*. The phrase is clear in its meaning. It signifies action proceeding from a grant specially conferred, not action in virtue of a permanent power. Therefore Caesar Augustus denies that he possessed and normally exercised *imperium consulare*. There is no escape.

[19] That is not all. A still closer scrutiny must be brought to bear on the passage of Dio. In his language the grant of consular authority for life is defined by an explanatory (or perhaps limiting) clause—‘consisting in the right to bear the twelve *fascēs* everywhere and to sit on a *sella curulis* between the two consuls’. That being so, it is perhaps permissible to tone down Dio’s consular authority ([τὴν ἐξουσίαν ... τὴν δὲ τῶν ὑπάτων]), reducing it from the grant of power to the conferment of honorific privileges. That was the conclusion of Mommsen.³⁸ Therefore *imperium consulare* evaporates. Much effort and good will for nothing.

A question remains. Can anything of value be salvaged from Dio’s statement about measures passed in 19 BC? Perhaps: the right to bear the twelve *fascēs* everywhere. That right can be regarded as much more than mere honour and

³⁵ Gibbon assumed it [*Decline and Fall*, ch. 1, § 24].

³⁶ Cass. Dio 54.10.5. See T. Mommsen, *Res gestae Divi Augusti ex monumentis Ancyranis et Apolloniensi* (Berlin 1883) 27.

³⁷ Cf. e.g. H. F. Pelham, ‘Problems in the Constitution of the Principate’, in *Essays* (Oxford 1911) 49–88.

³⁸ [Cf. above, n. 36] See L. Wickert, *RE* XXII, 2270–8.

pageantry. Since 23 BC Augustus had no *insignia* in the city of Rome. Twelve fasces conceded in 19 BC that could be nothing less than the legalisation of his provincial *imperium* at Rome. Not visibly to be distinguished from the *imperium* of a consul, but not the same in theory and never officially admitted to be the same—even though under this cover may appear to usurp each and all of the consular prerogatives.

The explanation might appear to belong to the realm of casuistry and sophistry. Let the charge be cheerfully admitted. Those arts and devices are inherent in the *princeps*' dealings with the *res publica*.

To follow that line. If one puts heavy emphasis on the *insignia imperii* in other ages of Roman history and the recent past, one is not entitled to brush aside their significance in 19 BC. If a man bears in the city the twelve *fasces*, it would be difficult or paradoxical to deny him possession of the *imperium* which those *fasces* connoted. It is only a short step, barely perceptible, to the exercise of the prerogatives of the consular office.

One must know and confess what one keeps or rejects from the written sources. The explanation here proffered has to throw over Dio [20] on censorial powers, but retains and exploits what he says about consular authority and twelve *fasces* (and also, if it be thought to matter, the seat between the two consuls).

It would be useful if that minimal statement could find confirmation somewhere or other. Nothing conclusive emerges about the place where the early Caesars sat. Between, but sometimes not between, the consuls. More important, the *insignia*. It would be worth knowing when the fasces of the emperor are first on clear record. Returning from the western lands in 13 BC, Caesar Augustus entered Rome by night and on the day after took the laurelled wreath from his *fasces* and placed it on the knees of Jupiter's statue on the Capitol.³⁹ He was performing the modest symbol of a triumph. A proconsul kept the fasces for the days of his triumph, but no longer. For certitude one must wait till the beginning of Nero's reign: the *fasces* laurelled for a diplomatic success in the East.

* * *

Augustus (as has been shown) refused to admit that he possessed *imperium consulare* so defined and conferred. Is there any trace of it elsewhere?

The two pillars of the imperial power stand out clearly: the provincial *imperium* which Caesar Augustus retained when he resigned the consulate, and the *tribunicia potestas* (employed in and from 23 BC). If a man held those powers, he could conduct the government of Rome and the Empire.

When Augustus died, the oath of allegiance was at once rendered to his successor. Further, Tiberius Caesar was already in possession of *tribunicia potestas* and of an authority equal to that of Augustus over provinces and

³⁹ Cass. Dio 54.25.3.

armies. Tacitus is careful to show the ruler in exercise of the powers, convoking the Senate and issuing commands to the troops. What more did the successor of Caesar Augustus require?

[21] *Imperium consulare* might be the ready and helpful answer. That can hardly avail, for it cannot be shown that Augustus had *imperium consulare*. Possibly therefore the duties and acceptable equivalent, the right to bear at Rome the twelve *fascēs* of the provincial *imperium*. There is, however, no evidence that Tiberius used *fascēs*; and it could be surmised, given his character and attitudes, that he would be bitterly hostile to such a parade of authority, as to any form of pageantry.

No clue emerges in the debate of the Senate a month after the decease of Augustus. That debate was false in its setting (of necessity), unsatisfactory in its conduct. It had been introduced, as Tacitus indicates, by a *relatio* of the two consuls. The tenor and fate of that motion is a matter of conjecture. It is not certain that it contained any more than the loyal wish that Tiberius Caesar should continue in the powers he already possessed. It is therefore open for anybody to speculate that the *relatio consulum* included a reference to the prerogative of twelve *fascēs* ...

More might be said about the debate of September, 17 in its various aspects—notably a perplexity (in some of those present perhaps genuine) as to what the principate consisted in. For a principate of Tiberius different in certain formulae or prerogatives from that exercised by Caesar Augustus was by no means inconceivable. Indeed, Tiberius already had a principate. If he did not choose to continue in that principate, he would have to surrender certain defined and legal powers.

However that may be, one thing can be asserted. There is no evidence anywhere that the central authority of the Caesars was conceived and formulated as *imperium consulare*. And there is documentation to the contrary. Not merely the special and temporary assumption of that power by Augustus for the holding of a census, but two other items.

First, Claudius Caesar took care to have himself invested with consular powers to celebrate games on the occasion of his British triumph. That may appear perverse and pedantic. No matter, it was correct; and Claudius was erudite in *Staatsrecht*.

[22] Secondly, and more instructive. In the year 51 the boy Nero was granted, according to Tacitus, *imperium proconsulare extra urbem*.⁴⁰ Now the *imperium* of a proconsul can only exist and be valid outside the city of Rome. Why, therefore, in this instance the precise statement and limitation? An inference is permissible. Namely this: the *imperium* of the Caesars was normally regarded as a proconsular *imperium*, domiciled and legitimised in

⁴⁰ [Tac. *Ann.* 12.41.2.]

the city. The historian Tacitus generally avoids with anxious care the technical terms of public law and administration. This time, by exception, his testimony is precise and valuable.

* * *

Caesar Augustus brought back the sovereignty of *Senatus Populusque Romanus*. The theory is impeccable. His position, in so far as legal, reposes on delegated authority—the other name is legalised absolutism.

If the Republic was restored, when was it abolished again? There is a plain answer. In AD 14. For two reasons. First the Principate, being transmitted, becomes permanent—and, it appears, the fiction of decennial renewals was given up. Secondly, and on a formal and traditional view perhaps more significant, the transference of elections from the Campus to the Curia. So long as the People elected, however guided and managed, however curbed and restricted, the Republic subsisted, for the consulate was the palladium of the Republic. *Libertatem et consulatum L. Brutum instituit*.⁴¹

Another interpretation could be invoked. In 19 BC (if it be legitimate to choose one of the item retailed by Cassius Dio, to choose and also to modify), Caesar Augustus was able to install at Rome the twelve *fasces* of his provincial *imperium*. The enquiry can end, where it began, with experts on the law of the constitution.⁴² On Cicero's explanation of what was done when the monarchy fell, there could not be more than twelve *insignia imperii* in a Republic.⁴³ In 19 BC and [23] thereafter the total was exceeded. Not only, as hitherto, the twelve *fasces* passing in rotation between the two consuls, but the twelve *fasces* of Caesar Augustus.

* * *

To conclude. Not consular but proconsular *imperium*, that is the official conception. Theory and fact arrive at a miraculous accord. Caesar Augustus is the last in the sequence of monarchic faction-leaders. Absolute power had been wielded through dictatorship, Triumvirate, or consulship, it is true; but the central and unitary *imperium* of Caesars stands in the direct sequence of the *extraordinaria imperia* of the great proconsuls, now installed and domiciled in the city of Rome.

⁴¹ [Tac. *Ann.* 1.1.1.]

⁴² A. H. M. Jones, 'The Imperium of Augustus', *JRS* 41 (1951), 112–19, at 112–13 [= *Studies in Roman Government and Law* (Oxford 1960) 1–17, at 1–3].

⁴³ Cic. *Rep.* 2.55.

Rome and Umbria

The history of Italy in the Roman period has yet to be written. Perhaps the task goes beyond the limits of knowledge. In war or peace, Republic or Empire, the dominant city submerges the native peoples. On some the armed might of the legions bore heavily in repeated wars, their young men were killed and their lands were taken, while others, huddling into the Roman alliance for protection against fierce neighbours, found that they had forfeited the occasion, and sometimes the will, to resist and rebel. The easy way and inglorious claimed the Umbrians—they have no conspicuous portion in any of Italy's desperate struggles for liberty against the imperial Republic. It is in the Civil War that the cities of Umbria must fight and suffer, the wars whereby the union of Italy was consummated in violence and the monarchy was born. Then peace envelops the whole country, and nothing happens for long ages.

Where can the history of Umbria be discovered? Only the annals of literature are not a blank, and there the light is meteoric, not a continuous illumination. In the beginning the greatest of the Latin comic poets, T. Maccius Plautus, came from the town of Sarsina, in the far north, in the border country, beside the Gauls and the Ligurians; and the Augustan prime exhibits the Roman Callimachus, Sextus Propertius from [2] Asisium. There is another name that might belong to Umbria, and one of the most renowned, T. Lucretius Carus.¹ Of his origin, nothing is known. Yet if any conjecture is to be hazarded, it would be better to discard extreme theories that his extraction was either servile or patrician (and the patrician Lucretii had been extinct for centuries), to turn instead to the middle class, to the towns of Italy whence Rome drew her strength and sustenance, and suppose that the poet derived from reputable municipal stock, in Umbria perhaps or Etruria or the Sabine land.

Lucretius may not with safety be invoked. Nor is there any need. Propertius alone is firm guarantee of a splendid effervescence of civilisation. The roots of it lie deep in the past, in Italy's Etruscan age.

[Unless otherwise stated, all the notes to this text have been added by the Editor.]

[1] ¹ Cf. W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin 1904) 182–3.

The Umbrians had once been a considerable people, so tradition recalled and all evidence confirms, before they were pressed back and confined within the boundaries they occupy in the Roman period. On the west they lost ground to the Etruscans—Pliny speaks of three hundred *oppida* conquered, and it is a fair assumption that Perusia, for example, had once been Umbrian.² Then the Gauls wrested from them the coastal strip known as the *ager Gallicus* between the rivers Rubico and Aesis, from Ariminum down towards Ancona; and on the east they were confronted with the most formidable of enemies, the fighting men of Picenum. The bronze tablets found at Iguvium [3] give a hint of ancient wars and feuds, with solemn curses upon the enemies of the Iguvini.³ The formula goes back before the coming of the Gauls—or the Romans. Four peoples are named, the Etruscans, the Tadinates who are the neighbours of Iguvium on the east, the Nahartes and the *Iapusco nome*. The Nahartes dwelt along the river Nar in the south-east toward the Sabine country, while the *Iapusco nome*, whose name unmistakably recalls the Japudes beyond the Adriatic, can hardly be anything other than an Illyrian tribe in Picenum.⁴

But Iguvium was only one among the cities in Umbria, not the first in antiquity or in renown, and it lay apart, secluded in a fold of the Apennines. There was Tuder, strong and high placed above the Tiber, ruling a wide territory, and showing its prosperity by an ample coinage; Ameria its neighbour to the south, founded, so Cato averred, fifty years after the Trojan War (he gave the date, which corresponds to 1134 BC);⁵ Interamna on the Nar—or rather its predecessor of unknown name—went back to 654 BC in the modest estimate of its citizens, proudly recorded on an inscription;⁶ while Mevania and Fulginiae were situated right in the path of armies, at the strategic centre of the land in the long Umbrian valley that runs north from Spolegium and curves west towards Perusia.

Umbria like Etruria must have had a tangled and vivid history—the feuds of dynasties, the wars of the cities, noble [4] families expelled and restored, clan-leaders on the march with their clients, or alien adventurers with heterogeneous armies, new strongholds founded and new cities. Spolegium stood guard against the Sabines and the Nahartes or contended against Mevania and Fulginiae for the rich plain watered by the Clitumnus; the Camertes commanded the way from Picenum with the central tract of Umbria; and Tuder the strong city was a bastion against the Etruscans across the river. The whole story is lost, not the faintest wisp of legend to preserve the faded name of some

² Plin. *Nat.* 3.113.

³ E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* (Heidelberg 1953) no. 239; J. W. Poultney, *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium* (Baltimore 1959).

⁴ VIb 54–9, VIIa 12, 47–8.

⁵ Cato the Elder, F 49 Peter [= *FRHist* 5 F 55] (= Plin. *Nat.* 3.114).

⁶ *CIL* 11.4170 = *ILS* 157.

god-descended king, or the distant exploits of an ancestor. The aristocracies survived in Umbria, but the aristocratic tradition, truth and fiction, has not been handed down, only the cities stand to stir the fancy. Tudor paid especial honour to the god of war, and the bronze image of a warrior found there may be appropriately be designated as the 'Mars of Todi'.⁷ Yet the earliest event recorded about Tudor is not a martial exploit but only a martial portent, arms clashing in the sky, when Rome and her allies fought for Italia against the northern barbarians in the third consulate of C. Marius; and the first siege of Tudor is also the last, it occurs in a civil war, when M. Crassus captured the city (82 BC).⁸

Even the Roman conquest of Umbria, which falls in the period of wars against the Samnites, the Etruscans, and the Sabines (310–[5] 290 BC) is a thin story, or no story at all. The names of Samnite chieftains—Pontius, Papius, Staius, and Egnatius—were preserved by tradition, or plausibly supplied by annalists who took them from the Italian insurrection of 91 BC. But there are no Etruscan generals—only the Cilnii of Arretium are mentioned by Livy, a dynastic family supported by the Romans, and famous as a maternal ascendancy of C. Maecenas.⁹ Nobody seems to have bothered to produce a native Umbrian leader in the wars. Nor are many places recorded in Livy's narrative: only Camerinum and Ocriculum taken into the Roman alliance, a battle at Mevania (in which a mysterious Umbrian tribe, the *plaga Materina*, showed great dash and spirit),¹⁰ the capture of Nequinum of the Nahartes, a Roman army camped near Arna, and Rome's decisive victory over the confederate levies at Sentinum (295 BC).¹¹

These are the first cities of Umbria that the Roman annals know, and the others take a long time to emerge. Even Spoletium has no attestation in its Umbrian age, only the foundation of the Latin colony is registered (241 BC).¹² Cato in his *Origines* gave prominence to the antiquities of Italy—he was a *novus homo* and no doubt eager to assert the merits of his stamp of man in the face of the Roman aristocracy, and demonstrate that Rome did not deserve to command a monopoly of Italian history. Though sympathy as well as knowledge went [6] to the writing of the *Origines*, the work was a peculiar mixture of fact and fancy, native legend being interpreted, expanded, and adorned with the speculations and the inventions of the Greeks. Touching Umbria two fragments only survive, the portentous antiquity of Ameria, and a comment to the activities of Roman moneylenders at Camerinum.¹³

⁷ E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* (Heidelberg 1953) no. 230 [= *Imagines Italicae* Umbria/Tudor 2].

⁸ Plut. *Crass.* 6.5.

⁹ Livy 10.3.2.

¹⁰ Livy 9.41.15.

¹¹ Livy 10.9.8–10.5; 24.1–31.15.

¹² Livy *Per.* 20; Vell. 1.14.8.

¹³ F 49 Peter [*FRHist* 5 F 55] (= Plin. *Nat.* 3.114); Fest. 268.8–13 L. (= *ORF*⁴ F 56).

In later annalists the industry and the preoccupations of a Cato are overborne by other interests, artistic and moral, patriotic and partisan. Livy was one of the new Romans, but not from the ancient stocks of the land south of the Apennines, akin in some way to the Latins by race or tongue or by a community of civilisation and a long history. The new *Italia* was his country, *Italia Transpadana*. In his annals of Rome from the birth of the city, seven centuries and more to the apex of conquest and empire under the Principate of Caesar Augustus (9 BC), the Patavine historian was pleased to expatiate upon the antiquities of Carthage, the migration of the Gauls, and even the geography and ethnography of the Gallic and Germanic lands. There was no page or chapter for the old peoples, for the Etruscan, the Umbrian, and the Samnite. They enter only as rough and raw material, with slight attempt at shape or colour, to set off the struggles and the triumphs of the *Populus Romanus*.

It is a curious exercise, and instructive, to chronicle [7] the dates at which the various cities first find mention in what survives of Latin literature. Umbria was a country of small cities, and most of them are noted for the first time in the Augustan lists of communities compiled by Pliny the Elder, to appear again, if at all, in Ptolemy or in the documents that record the stations along the roads.¹⁴ Nor would one expect any notoriety, save accidental, of remote and secluded places like Urvinum in the far north, Tifernum high up in the Tiber valley marching with the territory of Arretium, the two towns called Pitinum beside the *Ager Gallicus*, or Tuficum, Attidium, and Matilica in the hill country along the border of Picenum. Yet certain cities of some size or consequence in the centre or south of Umbria manage to evade notice for a time. The long silence about Tuder is a striking fact. If Fulginiae and Interamna occur on one occasion each in the speeches of Cicero, there is no word of either Carsulae or Hispellum, before Strabo the geographer, and Asisium must wait for its own poet to tell its name.¹⁵

Propertius consecrates a few lines to the setting of his birthplace—the wall that climbs and crowns the hill of Asisium, and beneath, Mevania moist and foggy in the plain beside the Umbrian lake with water warmed by the summer heat.¹⁶ That is all. It was late in his poetical career that the [8] Roman Callimachus found a vocation for antiquarian verse, and when he moved away from the erotic theme, the legends he elected to celebrate were not local but metropolitan. Roman kings or Sabine, not Umbrian. A more ample theme was Virgil's majestic and national [poem], the winning of Italy by Aeneas as a prefiguration of Caesar Augustus and, issuing from the wars, the reign of peace, unity, and concord. For the muster of the martial peoples of Italy gathering to resist the Trojan invader, Virgil goes as far afield as Campania, the Marsi, and Nursia in the furthest recess of the Sabine country.

¹⁴ Plin. *Nat.* 3.112–14; Ptol. *Geogr.* 3.1.

¹⁵ Strabo 5.2.10; Prop. 4.1.125–6.

¹⁶ Prop. 4.121–6.

No Umbrian answers the call to arms. Aeneas gets allies from Etruria, even from a distant and obscure colony of the Etruscans, Mantua beyond the Po.¹⁷ Umbria is left out. The Umbrians, it is true, have no place of renown in the Roman wars for the conquest of Italy. It will be recalled, however, that they were dragged into the internecine disputes of Roman parties and generals—and one of recent and odious memory in the savage career of Caesar Augustus, the *Bellum Perusinum*. Perusia does not occur among the Etruscan cities in the *Aeneid*.¹⁸

If Virgil missed an opportunity, or deliberately evaded it, another exponent of the historical epic showed how to pay the honour to Umbria. The seventeen books of the *Punica* find few to read them, and fewer still to praise. Industry rather than talent, so ran the obituary notice on Silius Italicus, [9] and posterity has seldom seen fit even to acknowledge his industry.¹⁹ There are solid merits in this massive production and even bright patches, especially when he digresses to describe countries, towns, and tribes. The venerable consular was a devout admirer of Virgil, books as well as other objects were among his treasures, and he knew how to use them. To the muster of the Roman allies at Cannae the author of the *Punica* brings the levies of ten cities, from Narnia up to Sarsina, most of them with a phrase or an epithet for brief and felicitous adornment—Mevania and its rich pastures, Camerinum renowned for labour of the soil or war, Tuder prodigal in the worship of Mars, and so on.²⁰ The poet also gives them leaders, Piso for the Umbrians and Galba for the Etruscans.²¹ The name Piso might indeed commend itself to a scholarly antiquary, for it is probably not Latin but Etruscan; but ‘Piso’ and ‘Galba’ also belong to Roman history, and Silius’ own experience—a Piso conspired against Nero, and Galba made his proclamation in the year which bore the name of Silius Italicus the *consul ordinarius*. Not but what Silius could come out with an authentic and impeccable Umbrian name if he wanted to: he was a warrior at the Battle of Lake Trasimene called *Varenius Mevanas*, who possessed rich lands in the plain of Fulginiae.²² The invention avows the literary scholarship of Silius, and the educated reader would take the reference to Cicero’s speech *Pro Vareno*.

[10] It is the purpose of this brief survey not to compile a number of casual and picturesque details about Umbria from various authors of antiquity, but precisely to exhibit and exemplify the huge gaps in the written record. The story of the Roman conquest cannot be set forth as an orderly and intelligible narrative, so much the less, it should seem, the dull slow centuries thereafter.

¹⁷ Virg. *Aen.* 10.200–1.

¹⁸ Virg. *Aen.* 10.166–84.

¹⁹ Plin. *Ep.* 3.7.5: *maiores cura quam ingenio*.

²⁰ Sil. *Pun.* 8.456–62.

²¹ Sil. *Pun.* 8.463 and 469.

²² Sil. *Pun.* 4.544.

2. THE PACIFICATION OF UMBRIA

[1] The Roman conquest, if such it should be called, is an obscure process in the series of the great wars that established the Roman dominion in central Italy and finally, in 290 BC, carried it across the peninsula to the coast of the Adriatic. Roman relations with the Umbrians take their origin from the alliance with the Camertes, dated by Livy to 310 BC and close with the victory of Sentinum fifteen years later—Umbrians are included by Livy among the confederate forces present at that battle, with how much justice it might well be asked.²³

There had been nothing to put up a firm resistance in Umbria—no strong ethnic patriotism, no central power, but small units divided by the configuration of the land if by no other things. The Sarsinates in the north, though not alien, are yet very much like a people separate from the central Umbrians; and so are the Nahartes of the Nar Valley—the latter perhaps even Sabine rather than Umbrian.

How precisely do the Umbrians come into the story? Their role is neither primary nor important: Roman operations against the Etruscans led to crossing of their territory, to alliances and to conflicts. In 311 BC, Rome's northern frontier had been at peace for forty years, hostilities broke out with the Etruscans and went on, with intermittences, until 293 BC. The story, as told by Livy, is highly fictitious.²⁴ [2] In 311 BC all the Etruscans except the people of Arretium muster for an attack on Sutrium. A great battle ensues—the enemy, of course, superior in numbers so the historian affirms, but the Romans in valour—and with great slaughter the consul Aemilius is victorious. The next year finds the Etruscans still besieging Sutrium.²⁵ This time they are defeated, no less completely, by the consul Fabius. Elated by his victory, Fabius resolves to pursue the enemy through the Ciminian forest. He sends forward his brother, who had benefited from an Etruscan education, to spy out the land; and the brother in his secret mission gets as far as the *Camertes Umbri*, with which people he negotiates most successfully—they promise thirty days' supplies for the Roman army and full military support. The consul therefore crosses the Ciminian forest and spreads devastation in his track. The Etruscans gather, an army as great as never before appears before Sutrium, another battle consigns sixty thousand of them to death or captivity. Some authorities, so Livy states, put the battle not at Sutrium but at Perugia, but 'wherever it happened, it was a Roman victory'.²⁶ Perugia, Cortona, and Arretium sued for peace, and got a truce for thirty years. Not but what Fabius had to fight another battle near Perugia later in the year.

²³ Livy 10.27.2.

²⁴ Livy 9.32.

²⁵ Livy 9.35–7.

²⁶ Livy 9.37.12: *sed ubicumque pugnatum est, res Romana superior fuit.*

There is no further mention of Rome's allies the Camertes in these transactions, or subsequently in Livy before the year 295 BC. Umbrians are said, however, to have shared in the defeat which occurred either at Sutrium or at Perugia; [3] and later in the same year there is a small battle with Umbrians. The crowning victory is narrated under 308 BC. Hitherto the Umbrians had experienced none of the disasters of warfare, only the passage of a Roman army. They now raise rebellion, bring in a large part of the Etruscans, and concentrate a huge army at Mevania. Fabius appears on the scene.²⁷ The enemy in alarm would have dispersed to their fortified cities or given up the war altogether, but one Umbrian tribe insisted and impelled the rest. The Umbrian onslaught, however, collapsed, more were captured than killed, the army capitulated, and within a few days the other Umbrian peoples surrendered. Special terms are mentioned for Ocrinum.²⁸

Nothing more is heard about Umbria for the next nine years, except for a minor expedition as a result of which two thousand Umbrians were trapped in a cave and burned to death.²⁹ Then in the year 299 BC, in a fashion quite abrupt and unexplained, Nequinum breaks into the narrative of Livy.³⁰ The Romans are discovered beleaguering the fortress. The siege was a slow business, treachery brought it to an end, and the Romans put a colony there, calling it Narnia, to serve as a defence 'against the Umbrians'.³¹ And to conclude the story, unspecified Umbrians appear along with the Gauls, Samnites, and Etruscans as adversaries of Rome at the battle of Sentinum in 295 BC.³²

It would be no profit to go into the detail of these matters. How flimsy was the fabric of Roman history in the period of the Samnite wars, Livy knew well enough, and he explains the cause of corruption in the official record—family pride and family legends, forged *tituli* and mendacious funeral orations.³³ Livy's observation is provoked by a conflict of evidence touching the years 322 BC.

The Etruscan wars narrated under 311–308 BC, with such a wealth of description, and such incoherence, reveal palmary examples of error and fiction, confusion and reduplication. The consul Aemilius is victorious at Sutrium in 311 BC, Fabius also in 310 BC—surely a doublet.³⁴ Three invasions of Etruria by Fabius excite suspicion, and few would be prepared to accept the Battle of Mevania. The official record of Roman triumphs shows two entries in these years, neither wholly convincing.

Q. Fabius Rullianus, consul five times, is patently the greatest hero of the age. That the story of the wars has been filled out and embellished with family tradition of the Fabii was an easy assumption; and as Fabius had P. Decius Mus for colleague in no fewer than three of his consulates (305,

²⁷ Livy 9.41. Cf. Eus. *Chron.* 116 S.

²⁸ Livy 9.41.13–20.

²⁹ Livy 10.1.6–8. ³⁰ Livy 10.9–10.

³¹ Livy 10.10.5: *colonia eo aduersus Umbros missa a flumine Narnia appellata.*

³² Livy 10.27.2. ³³ Livy 8.40. ³⁴ Livy 9.32–3, 35, 37, 41.

297, and 295 BC), it might be supposed that later events became attached to earlier consulates and consequently reduplicated. Yet it is by no means clear that Roman noble families are the main source of fiction and perturbation. Blaming the aristocratic tradition, Livy does less than justice to the imaginative efforts of his own predecessors, the [5] annalists. For example, Livy can furnish a splendid account of a victory at Volaterrae won by the consul Scipio Barbatus in 298 BC.³⁵ This does not appear to derive from Scipionic glorifications, the very *elogium* of the consul knows nothing of so resounding an exploit.³⁶

If, as seems probable, the annalists took it as their task, not only to arrange the traditions in a proper order but also to expand and develop their material so as to create a lively story and a rounded narrative, complete with plausible and edifying incidents, it is a fortunate thing that they fall so far short of artistic perfection—a smooth and thorough fabrication would have baffled criticism, whereas the gaps and incoherencies surviving are an encouragement to disbelief. What is told of the Ciminian forest, as pathless, says Livy, before Fabius made the venture, as were until recently the woods of Germany, is a patent exaggeration; and the alliance made with the Camertes and the military help they promise implies that the people lay beyond the Ciminian forest, in the vicinity where the invading Roman army would emerge, not beyond the Apennines on the frontier of Picenum.³⁷

Indeed, the gaps in the whole story of the wars from 311 BC to 290 BC are so considerable as to render illusory any attempt to reconstruct the course of events from the mere criticism, sifting, rejecting, and rearranging, of what happens to be recorded. Thus the first operations in central Etruria, which compel Perugia, Arretium, and Cortona to sue for peace in [6] the year 310 BC, have no mention of Clusium.³⁸ That city does not turn up in Livy until the year 295 BC, as the site of a Roman defeat.³⁹ Yet the attitude of Clusium in a war against Perugia, Arretium, and Cortona, whenever it happened, must have been a material, and perhaps a decisive factor. One would have expected not Camerinum, but Clusium, to have been Rome's ally in that campaign.

Again, it might seem that Roman armies, to strike at Perugia, must have marched, not through the Ciminian forest, but across Umbrian territory by a flanking movement. The crossing of Umbria is indeed hinted a little later in Livy (under 308 BC), and is explicit in Diodorus.⁴⁰ Yet there is no place name anywhere to show where the Romans passed, to explain how they could operate so far to the north. The Umbrian cities on the Etruscan border, Ameria and Tudur, are as though they had never existed.

The battle of Mevania in 308 BC is told as a defeat of the Umbrians as a whole people, with their surrender ensuing. In later days the main route into Umbria is through Narnia. Yet the Romans do not occupy Narnia until

³⁵ Livy 10.12.3–8.

³⁸ Livy 9.37.12.

³⁶ CIL 6.31587 = ILS 1.

³⁹ Livy 10.25.11.

³⁷ Livy 9.36.1.

⁴⁰ Livy 9.41.8; Diod. Sic. 20.44.

299 BC—an early stage not a late one, it should seem, in the subjugation of Umbria. Fraudulent victories have established themselves in the *Fasti triumphales*. But that document does not contain a single triumph purporting to have been celebrated over *Umbri*. What stands there under the year 299 BC is the triumph of the consul M. Fulvius Paetinus *de Nequinatibus Samnitibusque*.⁴¹ This is remarkable and significant. Now Livy recounts the fall of Nequinum. He does not call its inhabitants *Umbri*, he implies [7] that they were not *Umbri*.⁴² A valuable conclusion emerges. Though that part of the valley of the Nar which included Narnia (the successor of Nequinum) and Interamna is later reckoned in with the region known as Umbria, that terminology may be regarded as geographical rather than racial or national. It would be preferable to regard the Nahartes as Sabine rather than Umbrian. The same holds for Ocrinum on the Tiber, a dozen miles to the south of Narnia.

The Sabines themselves are one of the major problems of this period. No wars against *Sabini* are narrated, no triumph is recorded before the campaign of M. Curius in 290 BC. For this strange silence, two explanations have been put forward. The one theory supposes that the Sabines, hardy and warlike as ever, maintained their independence down to 290 BC by peaceful, sagacious, and unprovocative conduct. The other theory argues for a whole series of mistakes, deriving from the one cause. Ultimately the word ‘Sabine’ or ‘Samnite’ are identical: a number of the Samnite wars and Samnite triumphs really concern the Sabini. Certain pieces of evidence reveal the confusion unmistakably. For example, Livy has Amiternum, a town of the Samnites.⁴³ This is surely the well-known place in the Sabine country. Especially instructive is the record of Fulvius’ triumph in 299 BC—Nequinates and Samnites being mentioned together as vanquished adversaries of a consul’s campaign; the Samnites look very much like Sabini. Operations against the latter people may well have occurred, and more than [8] once before 290 BC; and the year 295 BC is highly plausible, for it witnessed the conquest of the Nahartes (themselves Sabine rather than Umbrian). Further, Livy under 299 BC registers the Roman alliance with the Picentes, the first historical mention of this nation:⁴⁴ Picenum is the north-eastern extension of Sabinum along the Via Salaria, and a strong and ancient tradition affirms that the Picentes were colonists from Sabinum.⁴⁵ The new allies at once displayed their loyalty to Rome by revealing hostile designs of the Samnites—again, it may be suggested, not authentic Samnites, but Sabine neighbours of the Picentes.

Enough has been said to make clear how much is fragmentary or fictitious in the whole annalistic context of the years 311–290 BC. Elaborate

⁴¹ *Inscr. It.* 13.1.72–3.

⁴² Livy 10.9.8–9.

⁴³ Livy 10.36.14.

⁴⁴ Livy 10.10.12.

⁴⁵ Strabo 5.3.1; Plin. *Nat.* 3.110.

studies have sought to elucidate the true course of events.⁴⁶ Yet it is a vain aspiration to hope for order out of incoherence, concord from contradiction. Even if a reconstruction be plausible and coherent, there is no guarantee of its truth, and the mere excision of fraud and error, if it leaves behind some facts, does not reveal a process intelligible in terms of history and geography.

To return to Umbria. The alliance with Ocriculum, put by Livy in 308 BC after his battle of Mevania, will clearly represent an early stage in the northward extension of the Roman power.⁴⁷ Ocriculum commands the crossing of the Tiber and the way north to the valley of the Nar. Next, the capture of Nequinum is of decisive moment, not only for the penetration of Umbria but also for the conquest of Sabinum; and the Picentine [9] alliance in the same year should not be neglected. Camerinum in Livy's narrative appears as Rome's earliest ally in Umbria, but patently in the wrong place, in the story of the Ciminian forest, of a campaign decided in the neighbourhood of Perugia.⁴⁸ The Camertine pact is an important event, the treaty was solemnly recalled to memory five centuries later, but it surely belongs to another context: Camerinum is situated to the east of the main chain of the Apennines, it lies on the route from the valley of the Nar across the middle of Umbria into Picenum. The treaty is best understood if it is related to the capture of Nequinum and the Roman alliance with the Picentes.

It must be repeated and emphasised that the Fasti attest no triumph over *Umbri*, but only over Nequinates in this period; and the next and last authentic detail of war with any people in the tract of territory called Umbria is the triumph over the Sarsinates in 266 BC. What emerges is briefly this. Livy has all the Umbrians mustering at Mevania. The consul Fabius, however, either exhorting the Roman troops, is made to proclaim that this transaction is of subsidiary consequence—*exigua appendix Etrusci belli*.⁴⁹ The consul was right. There was in fact no conquest of Umbria, but rather the establishment of a Roman protectorate. It was only the transit of Roman armies, in the first instance to outflank the Etruscans, that brought Umbria into the story of the wars. To confirm this general picture, something more must be said about Roman policy in Umbria and in the regions adjacent, with especial reference to geography and to communications.

⁴⁶ See e.g. G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, II (Turin 1907) 328–64; E. Pais, *Storia critica di Roma durante i primi secoli*, IV (Rome 1920) 37–85, 150–76, 212–19; K. J. Beloch, *Der italische Bund unter Roms Hegemonie: Staatsrechtliche und statistische Forschungen* (Leipzig 1880) 421–34, 438–51.

⁴⁷ Livy 9.41.20.

⁴⁸ Livy 9.36.2–9.

⁴⁹ Livy 9.41.16: 'a brief appendix to the Etruscan war'.

3. CAMERINUM

The one buttress of the Roman power in southern Umbria was Narnia, the other was Spolegium, separated by a mountain range from the plain of the Nar that extends between Narnia and Interamna and situated at the head of the broad valley that runs down to the region of Mevania and Fulginiae. Despite that advantageous position, the Latin colony of Spolegium was not established until 241 BC.⁵⁰

Twenty-one years after the foundation of Spolegium the censor Flaminius laid out the great north road and gave it his name, emulating the famous Appius Claudius, and even surpassing the Appia. The Via Flaminia ran from Rome two hundred and twelve miles to Ariminum, the frontier post and military base at the northern extremity of the *Ager Gallicus*. From Narnia, where it goes over the river Nar, the Flaminia proceeds north to Carsulae, skirts the western flank of the Monte Martano in its passage through the territory of Tuder, descends to Mevania, and strikes right across the plain, seven miles in an unerring diagonal to Forum Flaminii (beside Fulginiae, barely two miles to the north of that place). Here the road enters the hill country by the alley of the Tinis (Topino), and takes a northward course by Nuceria Camellaria and Tadinum to the crossing of the Apennines at the Pass of Scheggia (about eight miles north-east of Iguvium). Issuing from the pass, the Flaminia still keeps a northerly direction for a time, then bends and has to negotiate another pass at [2] Furlo. Thence by way of Forum Sempronii it reaches the coast of the Adriatic at Fanum Fortunae, and from Fanum it is a straight run through Pisaurum to Ariminum.

The Flaminia captures and holds the imagination, one of those primordial facts of history and historical geography that seem inevitable and foreordained. Yet the Flaminia was neither the earliest nor the easiest line of approach to the tract between Ancona and Ariminum known as the *Ager Gallicus*. One part of its course indeed presents extraordinary difficulties for the passage of an army. The Pass of Scheggia itself is both low and easy, but all the way from the Pass of Scheggia to the Pass of Furlo the road must take a course that can only be described as one long defile, for some twenty-five miles. Careful attention must therefore be given to the routes leading eastward from the line of the Flaminia before it reaches the Pass of Scheggia. There are several that penetrate the region about the headwaters of the rivers Truentum, Flusor, and Aesis, between the main chain of the Apennines and the range that forms the boundary against Picenum and the *Ager Gallicus*. In this land were the Umbrian cities Camerinum, Matilica, Attidium, Tuficum, and Sentinum. Of eastward routes, branching off at different points between Fulginiae and

⁵⁰ Livy *Per.* 20.2; Vell. 1.14.8.

Scheggia, no fewer than four may be mentioned, though only one happens to be certified as a road in the Roman *Itineraria*.

First comes the way from Fulginiae to Camerinum and beyond, linking the central Umbrian valley with Picenum and the Adriatic coast: it is of primordial importance, and will be discussed more fully later on. Next, the Antonine Itinerary registers a road diverging from the Flaminia near Nuceria Camellaria and going to the [3] station of Prolaque in the north of the territory of Camerinum, thence to Septempeda in Picenum, and further, by way of Treia and Auximum to Ancona. Thirdly, a route leads off from the Flaminia about five miles north of Tadinum, just short of the station of Helvillum and crosses the main chain of the Apeninnes by the Pass of Fossato. Beyond the pass this route gave access either to Sentinum (near Sassoferrato), and thence to Sena Gallica, or to Tuficum (Albacina) and the valley of the Aesis. Roman mile-stones at Sassoferrato and at Arcevia probably indicate the course of the road to Sena Gallica. It should be added that these parts east of the Passo del Fossato, in which lay the towns of Attidium, Tuficum, and Sentinum, could also be reached from Camerinum. Finally, from the *statio ad Aesim* near the southern entrance of the Pass of Scheggia there is a route east to Sentinum, but it leads through a considerable gorge.

The Roman armies marched into central and northern Umbria, even to Ariminum, long before the Flaminia was built. It is by no means certain that they anticipated its course all the way. Indeed, it is most unlikely, given their earliest strategic objectives. If their first goal, like that of the Flaminia itself, was the neighbourhood of Mevania and Fulginiae, their next lay surely not to the north but to the north-east, in the mountain-girt land over against Picenum. It was precisely Camerinum, the strong city of their trusty allies. Camerinum is not merely a place on, or beside, a road coming from Umbria and going to Picenum—it had a connection northwards with the [4] valley of the Aesis by way of Matilica and Tuficum. Now Camerinum was clearly the Roman base in the Campaign of Sentinum.

Almost everything is obscure in the matter, even to the identity of some of the nations that made up the confederate army, and only the broad outlines of the strategic situation can be recovered. Gauls and Samnites, having effected a junction somewhere east of the Apennines, were making an attempt to get through the mountains and unite with their allies in Etruria. Their first effort brought a victory over the Romans in the territory of Camerinum, but they did not choose, or were unable, to force their way through to Fulginiae. Another battle took place a few days later, in the land of the Sentinates, according to Polybius.⁵¹ Perhaps the confederates had been trying to reach and cross the Pass of Fossato. If so, they were frustrated. Both Roman consuls,

⁵¹ Plb. 2.19.6.

Fabius Rullianus and Decius Mus, are said to have been present at the battle. The Romans may have succeeded in concentrating their forces somewhere east of the Pass of Fossato—perhaps one army marching for Fulginiae and Tadinum, the other coming up from Camerinum by way of Matilica and Tuficum. The area included in the ‘land of the Sentinates’ at this time naturally baffles closer definition. For all that can be known the site of the battle might have been near Attidium or Tuficum—the earlier status of those places is completely obscure, their first appearance being as Umbrian communities on the official list in the time of Augustus.⁵² If it could be taken as certain that the battle occurred at Sentinum itself, or very near it, it probably means that the confederates were caught at a disadvantage, [5] their only way westward being the difficult path to the vicinity of the Pass of Scheggia.

A dozen years after the Battle of Sentinum the Romans expelled the Senones from the *Ager Gallicus* and annexed the territory between the Aesis and the Rubico. A colony of Roman citizens was established, either now or a few years later, at Sena Gallica on the coast, half way between Ancona and Fanum Fortunae. Yet their line of communication with Sena need not have been identical with the Flaminia. It might have run from Narnia by Interamna and Spoletium to Fulginiae, from Fulginiae to Camerinum, and from Camerinum either eastwards towards Ancona or northwards by way of Matilica and Tuficum; from the latter region there was transit by two ways to the coast of the Adriatic.

The fortress city of Perugia, Etruscan but once Umbrian, dominates the approach to Umbria from the west, but the strategic centre of the land lies near the middle of the Umbrian valley, about equidistant from Perugia to the west and Spoletium to the south, precisely on the plain between Fulginiae and Mevania. The first historical mention of Mevania occurs in Livy, telling how the host of the Umbrians mustered there in 308 BC and was defeated by the Roman general Q. Fabius Rullianus:⁵³ if the episode is not perhaps authentic, the site is plausible enough. Again, when Hannibal came over to the Apennines and marched through Etruria on his way to the eastern coast, a battle might have ensued in the vicinity and not beside Lake Trasimene—and Hannibal might have had to fight not only Flaminius following behind him from Arretium, but the other consul as well; Cn. Servilius, marching down the Flaminia from Ariminum. And, finally, during the War of Perugia (41–40 BC) it nearly came to a clash near Fulginiae, not once but twice.

[6] Beside Fulginiae the Flaminia crosses the route along the valley between Spoletium and Perugia and creates a junction of four roads. But that is not the full story. There is also the road to Camerinum, leading into Picenum. It was much frequented in later ages when various parts of the Flaminia had fallen

⁵² Plin. *Nat.* 3.113.

⁵³ Livy 9.41.8–20.

into disuse, and has a conspicuous part in medieval and modern history as the highroad from Rome to Ancona, crossing the mountains by the Pass of Colfiorito (about 2500 feet above sea level). At the present day it carries more traffic than any other Transapennine communication.

Now Plestia lies on the road to Camerinum, just beyond the Pass of Colfiorito. Plestia is a much neglected place. The only record of it in all ancient literature is in Pliny's list of Umbrian communities. But the name survives as Pistia and inscriptions confirm the localization.⁵⁴ Plestia was situated about a dozen miles east from Fulginiae, beside a small marshy plain, which is subject to inundation. There was once a lake here, and the lake of Plestia happens to be attested by a historical compiler, Appian.⁵⁵

An intricate problem of the Hannibalic War is involved, the defeat of a Roman Commander, C. Centenius, a few days after the Battle of Lake Trasimene. There are two distinct accounts of the matter, the one in Appian, the other in Polybius and Livy.⁵⁶ According to the latter authorities, when the consul Cn. Servilius heard that Hannibal had descended into Etruria, he made ready to march into Umbria, sending ahead the cavalry, four thousand in number, under the command of Centenius. But Centenius' force was met and cut to pieces by Maharbal after the Battle of Trasimene, [7] and Rome learned of a second disaster three days after the news of Trasimene. What Appian relates cannot be reconciled with this plain story. He says that Centenius was despatched from Rome to the lake of Plestia to occupy the pass and defend the road to Rome; and the battle he describes takes place near the lake and the pass.⁵⁷

Such being the major discrepancy, there is no call to dwell on minor details; and there would be little profit in recapitulating the various discussions which the episode has evoked. Let it suffice to say that for various reasons it seems unlikely that the catastrophe occurred precisely at the lake of Plestia: the time-interval for Maharbal to get from Trasimene to Plestia and for the news to be carried to Rome will not fit Polybius' indication (three days after the report of Trasimene). Most scholars therefore discount Plestia and put the disaster of Centenius further westwards, in the direction of Perusia.⁵⁸

However it be, Appian has preserved a valuable geographical detail. Though prone to all manner of error and confusion, he need not be accused of inventing a lake of Plestia. The very oddity of the detail inspires a certain confidence. How the story came to include the lake baffles conjecture. Perhaps Centenius had marched not by the Flaminia but by the Camerinum road. Even if that be not so, that road is still a factor to be reckoned with in the history of the year 217 BC. Hannibal, so Polybius affirms, proceeded through Umbria and into Picenum: ten days spent in ravaging brought him to the vicinity of

⁵⁴ Pliny *Nat.* 3.114 (Plestini); cf. *CIL* 11, pp. 812–13. ⁵⁵ App. *Iber.* 11.

⁵⁶ App. *Hann.* 11; Plb. 3.86; Livy 22.8–9. ⁵⁷ App. *Hann.* 9.

⁵⁸ See e.g. G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, III, 2 (Turin 1917) 122–4.

the Adriatic.⁵⁹ It may be assumed that he took the Pass of Colfiorito and traversed the territory of Plestia. Where else can he have gone?

4. SPOLETIUM AND THE VIA FLAMINIA

In monumental splendour Spolegium occupies a rank not far below the first among the cities of Umbria; as a place of arms it set its imprint upon the Gothic and Vandal Wars; and the political history of Italy in the early Middle Ages was influenced throughout a long stretch of time, and even dominated, by a power known as the Duchy of Spoleto. It may be worth the effort to go further back into the annals of Spolegium and enquire how much the city mattered during its earlier existence under the Roman Republic and in the revolutionary wars before the unification of Italy under the Principate of Caesar Augustus.

Spolegium was established as a colony of the Latin right in the year 241 BC.⁶⁰ That year saw the end of the First Punic War. It seems also to have marked a definite stabilization in Rome's policy towards her dominion and towards her allies in central Italy. Unlike the colonies of Roman citizens, which were very small (three hundred men looks like the standard complement), and were established at points along the coasts of Italy, the Latin foundations were usually units of considerable magnitude, with a larger contingent of settlers, often three or four thousand, and a wider territory to command and exploit. The domain of Spolegium may have embraced an area of something like a hundred and seventy square [2] miles. On the east it marched with Sabine country, in a broken and mountainous zone along the river Nar. Interamna Nahars was its neighbour southward beyond Monte Somma, on the west stood Carsulae and Tuder, northwestwards Mevania, all of them Umbrian communities bound by alliance to Rome. To the north extended a flat valley, watered by the Clitumnus and other streams, towards Fulginiae, a dozen miles away. Between Spolegium and Fulginiae was Trebiae, a *municipium* under the Roman Empire. Its early history is a complete blank.

A substantial Latin colony planted in a strong position at the southern end of the Umbrian valley, and commanding the approach to the central and strategic vicinity of Fulginiae and Mevania should have an evident and powerful function in the Roman political and military system. One need only consider any one of the four bastions established to hem in and control the Samnites, Luceria, Venusia, Aesernia, and Beneventum. What precisely is the purpose of Spolegium? How does it fit into the network of roads and

⁵⁹ Plb. 3.86.9.

⁶⁰ Livy *Per.* 20.2; Vell. 1.14.5.

colonies whereby the Roman People extended and consolidated its rule throughout Italy? At once a hard fact juts out. Spolegium is not on the Via Flaminia. Between Narnia and Forum Flaminii the line of the Via Flaminia is certified in various and satisfactory fashions. According to Strabo the geographer, Carsulae and Mevania are on the Flaminia, while Spolegium lies off it, to the right.⁶¹ Again, Spolegium is not even mentioned [3] in the events of AD 69 when the generals of Vespasian crossed the Apennines and invaded Umbria. Vitellius had sent forces northwards, and ordered them to concentrate at Mevania.⁶² The place was well chosen as a base from which to attack and crush an enemy emerging from the hills, but the army lacked confidence and so did the Emperor. His visit served only to enhance the premonitions of disaster. Vitellius soon went away, and the troops drifted southwards, making no stand as the Flavians advanced. Antonius Primus therefore came on, occupied Carsulae and encamped there for a time; and the capitulation of the Vitellian army had for its scene a spacious theatre, the open plain north of Narnia.⁶³

Finally, various documents that catalogue the stations and distances on Roman roads. The section of the Flaminia between Narnia and Forum Flaminii is attested by the inscribed silver cups which travellers from distant Gades dedicated, as a memorial of their journey, at Vicarello, a shrine near Lake Bracciano, by the Antonine Itinerary and by the Peutinger Table.⁶⁴ The latter two documents, however, furnish additional information. They have an alternative route from Narnia northwards, by way of Interamna Nahars and Spolegium to Forum Flaminii; and this is the only line in the Jerusalem Itinerary. During the imperial period the eastern branch won importance at the expense of the original Flaminia in southern Umbria; Interamna and Spolegium became more prominent while Carsulae declined and ultimately perished.

[4] The course the Flaminia took through Carsulae and Mevania was the earlier in time. That fact was established long ago. It has sometimes been lost to sight, whether through the inadvertence of scholars, through prepossessions about the importance of Spolegium, or from a belief that the course of a strategic road should wherever possible have lain across Roman or Latin territory. An attempt may now be made to ask why the original line was chosen at all, how and why the eastern branch by Interamna and Spolegium came to supersede it. If satisfactory answers can be discovered, they may help to illuminate the course of history in several ages.

⁶¹ Strabo 5.2.10.

⁶² Tac. *Hist.* 3.55.4.

⁶³ Tac. *Hist.* 3.60; 3.63.

⁶⁴ CIL 11, p. 496-7.

The Flaminia fulfils the primary requisite of a military road—it is direct. Yet the gain, if set against the eastern branch, is not of much moment, five or six miles only. Ease or difficulty of passage would appear to be a relevant factor. Let the two branches be compared. The road from the valley of the Nar at Interamna must surmount a considerable elevation, the Monte Somma, on its way to Spoletium; thenceforward, however, it is easy going along the plain to Fulginia and Forum Flaminii. On the other hand, the Flaminia between Carsulae and Mevania, far the greater part of this stretch of twenty-five miles, traverses land remote from cities, hilly country broken by many ravines. In point of facility and convenience, despite the steep pill up the Monte Somma, the preference might seem to lie with the route that linked the Nar with the Umbrian valley where they were closest to each other. What then determined the [5] choice of the censor Flaminius? The Romans preferred high ground for the military roads, and a wide prospect against surprise, not liking to be enclosed in valleys; and indeed much of the valley northwards from Spoletium may have been marshy, owing to the vagaries of the slow-moving Clitumnus and other streams—if indeed there was not a lake in the plain below Trebiae, the *lacus Clitorius*. By contrast the original Flaminia can keep to open country most of the way between Narnia and Mevania.

A further conjecture may be presented. No doubt some sort of road provided transit from Interamna to Spoletium and the Monte Somma. For defence and for offence the Latin colony had been there for some years. Further west the Via Amerina gave access to Amerina from Falerii, and from Amerina presumably to the centre of Etruria, to the tract about Clusium and Perugia. A military road running through the territory east of Amerina and Tudert would offer a new line of penetration northwards and a new means of controlling western Umbria. Amerina and Tudert were formidable cities of ancient pride and power. Now the Flaminia between Carsulae and Mevania seems to be avoiding the vicinity of cities; and neither Carsulae nor Mevania was in any posture to interfere seriously with the Roman communications or stand a siege. Mevania was notoriously a city of the plain. Carsulae is anything but a strong place—its site was chosen for the security, not of its inhabitants but of the Romans, who probably at the time of the conquest transplanted to Carsulae, [6] an Umbrian community from a hill town not far away.

The plan and purpose of Flaminius' road having been investigated, it is time to ask why the section between Narnia and Forum Flaminii forfeited its importance and lost custom in favour of the route through Spoletium. The result, surely, of a gradual change, not any single considered act of the imperial government. The Flaminia, it must be reiterated, was a military road, and as such may not have served all the needs of traffic in the long years of the imperial peace. Between Narnia and Mevania it touched only one city, Carsulae, and Carsulae was never a place of great consequence; nor have cities been able to grow and flourish along that tract in more recent times. Narnia

itself did not prosper unimpeded—at least in 199 BC its citizens complained that they were below strength.⁶⁵ Narnia has never been a large city. The eastern branch links richer lands. It boasts the two cities of Interamna and Spoletium, which have been able to maintain rank throughout the ages, whether in war or in peace. Interamna and Spoletium would tend to drag the north trunk road in their direction. This is not all. Other communications might exert a powerful influence. The Flaminia along the section in question between Narnia and Mevania cannot have been joined by anything more important than local roads from the west, from Ameria and Tuder. The other branch shows an advantage. Spoletium is not, it must be conceded, a vital road centre. Yet there was certainly a road [7] from Spoletium to the town of Nursia in the north of Sabinum. No itinerary records it, but only Vespasian's biographer in a casual note when he alludes to the place *Vespasiae* at the sixth milestone from Nursia towards Spoletium:⁶⁶ here family monuments stood, guaranteeing the repute of the Emperor's ancestry, at least on the maternal side. Whatever be thought of Spoletium as a road junction, there can be no doubt about Interamna—it gives quick and easy access southeastwards to Reate, the principal city of the Sabine land, and Reate itself is situated on a highway of ancient and permanent importance, the Via Salaria. Interamna's central and advantageous position continues to be effective—the modern city of Trevi is at the meeting place of five roads.

How and why the one road comes to supersede the other is now much clearer. By their size and prosperity, by their advantages in respect of other lines of communication, the cities of Interamna and Spoletium gather and monopolize the northward traffic. How soon the change became perceptible, there is no means of knowing. Perhaps at a quite early date. Strabo speaks only of the Flaminia;⁶⁷ and Strabo, a writer often guilty of serving up obsolete information, might not be safe testimony for conditions in the time of Augustus. Fortunately, there is the evidence of Tacitus, in his narrative of the Civil War of AD 69, to show that the name 'Flaminia' applied to the old road through Carsulae and Mevania;⁶⁸ and that road was still being repaired under Hadrian—there is a milestone at *Vicus Martis* on the territory of Tuder.⁶⁹

[8] It is a fair enough supposition that time and circumstance, not a government's decision, determined the new course of the Via Flaminia. If the change slowly became effective in the long years of the imperial peace, it was confirmed and perpetuated by the wars of the third and fourth centuries and served to influence military operations in Italy after the fall of the western Empire. Strong points and fortified cities, well garrisoned and well provisioned, are now the dominant factors. It is in the course of civil war that Interamna and Spoletium first come forward again in the pages of history. The

⁶⁵ Livy 32.2.6–7.

⁶⁶ Suet. *Vesp.* 1.5.

⁶⁷ Strabo 5.2.10.

⁶⁸ Tac. *Hist.* 3.79, 82; cf. 2.64.

⁶⁹ *CIL* 11.4748.

emperors Gallus and Volusianus, marching north to confront the usurper Aemilianus, were killed by their own soldiers at Interamna, and when Aemilianus in his turn perished some three months later, the scene of his end was Spolegium (AD 253).⁷⁰ This is a trivial matter, no doubt, and casually preserved. But it may be added that the prominence of Spolegium in a later military age is adequately exhibited by some half-dozen references in the *Bellum Gothicum* of Procopius.⁷¹

If the rank and function of Spolegium as a fortress is satisfactorily explained, there may still subsist uncertainty and even error about the wider strategic role of the city. In a war of movement with prospect of a decision in the field, the vital area where roads and armies meet in the middle of the Umbrian Valley near Mevania and Fulginiae, Spolegium cannot compete. It is primarily a fortress, more likely to find a place in history for a siege than for a battle, and it had to wait a long time for either, more than a century and a half from its foundation, when the cities of Italy are involved in a Roman civil war.

[9] Livy, it is true, inserts a picturesque and edifying episode in his account of Hannibal's movements after the Battle of Lake Trasimene.⁷² The victor marched on Spolegium, gave assault to the city and was repulsed with heavy loss. Such being the strength and the resolution of a single colony, the Punic invader conceived a very proper estimate of his chances against the city of Rome, and turned away. Polybius knows nothing of all this. Fiction may confidently be surmised, for all the pride of Spoletine citizens throughout the ages and despite the martial verses of a great Italian poet.⁷³

A few lines summarize all that is recorded of Spolegium's history as a Latin colony. The Hannibalic War dragged on, a heavy drain on the resources of Rome, the Latin, and the allies. In 209 BC twelve Latin colonies protested at Rome.⁷⁴ Narnia was of their number, but not Spolegium. In the course of the Third Macedonian War a man of Spolegium, a certain C. Carvilius, was usefully employed; but the Spoletini objected when the Roman government proposed to deposit the Illyrian monarch Gentius and his family with them for safe custody, so the allied city of Iguvium had to assume the burden.⁷⁵ For valour in the field during the defence of Italy against the Cimbri and Teutones, Marius gave the Roman citizenship to T. Matrinius, and duly protected his client when his status was impugned (95 BC).⁷⁶ There can have been no doubt of the loyalty of Spolegium when the *Italici* rose in [10] revolt—only one of the Latin colonies, so it seems, espoused the cause of the insurgents, Venusia.⁷⁷ The *Italici* were unable to break through from Picenum into Umbria—they

⁷⁰ *Epit. Caes.* 31.2–4.

⁷¹ *Proc. Bell. Goth.* 1.16, 17; 2.8, 11; 3.6, 12, 23; 4.33.

⁷² Livy 22.9.1–2.

⁷³ G. Carducci, 'Alle fonti del Clitumno', 67–76, from *Odi barbare* (1877).

⁷⁴ Livy 27.9.7–10.10.

⁷⁵ Livy 43.18.10, 19.7; 45.43.9–10.

⁷⁶ *Cic. Balb.* 48–9.

⁷⁷ *App. BC* 1.39.

did not make the attempt until the second year of the war, and it was frustrated.⁷⁸ Had they succeeded, a great battle might have ensued—but not at Spolegium, rather in the neighbourhood of Fulginiae and Mevania.

Because of Matrinius, and no doubt for other reasons, Spolegium stood by the party of Marius and Cinna when the *nobiles* led by Sulla came back to reconquer Italy. Shortly after Sulla's victory over Carbo at Clusium two of his generals, Crassus and Pompeius, defeated Carrinas in the plain and besieged him at Spolegium. Carrinas slipped away before long under cover of a stormy night. Spolegium was heavily penalized by the victorious party.⁷⁹

The next age of civil commotion reveals the colony as a military and political base. Not indeed in the war of Pompeius and Caesar—the swift invasion of Italy took another path. But Caesar's heir, only seven months after the assassination of the Dictator, raised a private army in Campania and marched on Rome. He entered the city on November 10, 44 BC, but finding scanty support there, went away to the north. It is stated that he recruited Caesarian veterans in the districts towards Ravenna, and commanded them to muster at Arretium. Arretium was the town of Maecenas, one of his principal adherents. A stray item [11] from a catalogue of omens in the encyclopedia of Pliny next shows him at Spolegium: the day was January 7, 43 BC, the occasion his entering upon the *imperium*. What he was doing at Spolegium, when news of the Senate's decree arrived, and who his agents were in the town, that might well give a spur to curiosity.⁸⁰

In this year the decision fell near Mutina in Gallia Cisalpina. The next fighting in 41 BC involved Etruria, Umbria, and the Sabine country. After confused marches and manoeuvres the consul L. Antonius, seeking to break through to the Cisalpina, was hemmed in at Perugia by Octavianus and Agrippa. Two attempts were made to relieve him by the Antonian generals, Ventidius and Asinius Pollio from the north, L. Munatius Plancus from the south. The first was abortive, and they retired. A valuable detail gives Spolegium as the base of Plancus and helps to explain the strategical situation—though not completely.⁸¹ Then they tried again, and advanced as far as Fulginiae: their five signals could be seen from Perugia, about twenty miles away. Yet even so, it did not come to an armed encounter. The evidence is fragmentary—one historian, Cassius Dio, has no word of the operations of the three Antonian generals—and the tradition is partial, being especially hostile to Plancus, whose excessive caution is alleged to have deterred the others. Plancus argued that they would be in bad posture for a battle, between the armies of Octavianus and of Agrippa: this may mean that he had been cut off from his base at Spolegium. So Perugia capitulated, and the Antonian generals dispersed. Ventidius and Asinius, [12] if a vague phrase of Appian can be trusted, had retreated to

⁷⁸ App. BC 1.49.

⁸⁰ Plin. Nat. 11.190.

⁷⁹ App. BC 1.90; Flor. 2.9.27–8.

⁸¹ App. BC 5.33.

Ravenna and Ariminum on the previous occasion.⁸² This time Asinius certainly went back to Gallia Cisalpina, no doubt taking the Flaminia. The movements of Ventidius are obscure all through. It may be conjectured that his bases lay in Picenum, the district of his origin, and he probably retreated there, either from Fulginium over the Pass of Colfiorito, by way of Plestia and Camerinum—or, if that road was being used by another general (i.e., Plancus), he may have taken one or other of the routes branching off the Flaminia further northwards. As for Plancus, a small detail shows which way he, or a part of his army at least, retired, and it was not to Spoletium but eastwards. Two of his legions were overtaken and forced to surrender at Camerinum: clear evidence that the Antonian generals were using the important road across the Pass of Colfiorito. Plancus made off to join M. Antonius across the sea, and what remained of his troops put themselves under the command of Ventidius.⁸³

Originally a bastion of the Roman power in Umbria, Spoletium was never attacked by a foreign enemy, so far as is known, not even by the insurgent *Italici*, but only by citizens. The political and military struggles of the revolutionary age gave the city a role of some magnitude. It forfeited that dubious advantage when regional and partisan loyalties were transcended in a united Italy bound to the allegiance of the Caesars.

5. ROMAN ANNEXATIONS IN UMBRIA

[1] The nature of the settlement between Rome and the Umbrians has to be deduced from subsequent evidence, or rather from the lack of it. The Umbrians, an easy prey, were treated with leniency by generals who had crushed the Samnites and chastened the Etruscans. The Romans did not seize much land for colonial foundations, perhaps none at all for *ager publicus* or for individual allotments. Security was enforced by treaties binding the various states and tribes to the suzerain. Some cities, such as Camerinum, enjoyed terms of high privilege. Other communities were compelled to come down from their hill fortresses and build new cities on the plain or at least on more accessible sites. Tudur and Ameria, ancient strongholds, remain as they were, but Carsulae seems comparatively recent. Mevania and Fulginiae are cities of the plain. Oriculum, the city farthest in the south, shifted from a hill to a site beside the Tiber at some time in the Roman period—perhaps not until a late date. The people of Interamna claimed an early origin for their [2] city (in the seventh century BC) and it is probably an early settlement,

⁸² App. BC 5.33.

⁸³ App. BC 5.50.

even though the situation beside the river Nar might not seem to suggest an ancient fortress.⁸⁴

The principal stronghold of the Nahartes was Nequinum. When the Romans captured it in 299 BC they planted there a colony of the Latin right, calling it Narnia.⁸⁵ The fortress on the rock where the river Nar deserts the plain and plunges into a gorge dominated the whole neighbourhood and gave access into central Umbria. The other buttress of the Roman power in Umbria, Spolegium, was not founded until 241 BC.⁸⁶ In the meantime, however, the Romans had annexed the *Ager Gallicus* and had put colonies there to control it and protect it, Sena (c.283 BC) and Ariminum (268 BC). At last in 220 BC the Via Flaminia was built, reaching the Adriatic beyond Sena, at Fanum Fortunae.⁸⁷ Its function is clear enough, both military and political—not only a straight swift road to the north for the defence of Italy (the formidable incursion of the Gauls in 225 BC was still present to the minds of men), but also a link with the settlements in the *Ager Gallicus* up to Ariminum. Flaminius had not only fought against the Gauls. He had a personal interest in the region, as the pertinacious [3] champion of the policy of distributing allotments to Roman citizens, as the bitter opponent of the land monopolists.

Roads and towns as instruments of conquest and of government are a commonplace of Roman history, Republican and imperial. Many a province takes form as the sphere of action of a magistrate or pro-magistrate moving along a road. Thus Macedonia may be regarded very much as the Via Egnatia, and Cilicia when Cicero governed it was built up around the highway from Laodicea to the Syrian Gates. And, to descend to matters of smaller consequence, Italian roads under the Empire acquired an administrative rôle. When the alimentary foundations were first devised, they were put under the charge of the *curatores* of the various roads; and the earliest *iuridicus* created in Italy at the beginning of the reign of Marcus Aurelius has a province defined as *Aemilia et Flaminia*.⁸⁸

It might have seemed axiomatic that the road from Rome to Ariminum traversed for most if not all of its course Roman or Latin territory. The facts overturn that assumption. Even thirty or forty miles beyond Rome the Flaminia may have been on Faliscan land. Across the Tiber at the forty-fifth milestone stood Ocriculum, the southernmost town in Umbria; but Ocriculum, so far as known, was [4] a *civitas foederata* down to the enfranchisement of Italy after the *Bellum Italicum*. Next came Narnia, a Latin colony, it is true. But beyond Narnia all the way across Umbria as far as the border of the *Ager Gallicus* near the Pass of Furlo, a stretch of about a hundred miles, the *Via Flaminia* appears to run through territory that is not Roman but allied, with

⁸⁴ CIL 11.4170 = ILS 157.

⁸⁵ Livy 10.10.5.

⁸⁶ Livy Per. 20.2; Vell. 1.14.5.

⁸⁷ Livy Per. 20.12.

⁸⁸ CIL 8.5354 = 8.17492 = ILS 1084.

one exception. That exception is a small patch, *Forum Flaminii*, along with the adjacent *Fulginiae*.

Many scholars have tacitly assumed that the Romans annexed a whole zone of territory in Umbria along the Flaminia, and some have argued that various Umbrian communities, here and there, had been incorporated in the Roman State through the *civitas sine suffragio* long before the enfranchisement of Italy, in fact at the time of the original conquest or very soon after.⁸⁹ The whole question of the extent of the Roman annexations in Umbria, on or near the Flaminia, must therefore be examined.

Arguments are based upon what can be known or inferred about the status of various communities before they were enfranchised, and sometimes upon the tribes in which they were enrolled. First, the type of magistracy. The actual enfranchisement of Italy after the *Bellum Italicum* had in [5] itself no immediate relevance to the constitutions of any communities that had not previously been *civitates foederatae*, that is to say, Roman colonies and Latin, *municipia*, and quasi-municipal entities such as *praefecturae* and settlements of Roman citizens, though it led in time to a certain extension and regularization of the municipal system. That is to say, the old magistracies continue, for example *praetores* or *duoviri* in Roman and Latin colonies, *octoviri* among the Sabines. Conversely, the occurrence of such types is generally taken as evidence that a community was a part of the Roman State before 90 BC.

On the other hand, though the mere grant of Roman citizenship did not affect the constitutions of *civitates foederatae* either, they might have been expected to show a change after incorporation, and in fact the quattuorviral system emerges among them. But not universally, or all at once. The presence after 90 BC of magistrates other than *quattuorviri* does not prove that a community had not been a *civitas foederata* (see further [p. 296]).

Direct evidence for the status of Umbrian towns before 90 BC is hard to come by. Of only three of the cities, Oriculum, Camerinum, and Iguvium is a treaty with Rome actually attested; and it is proved for a fourth, Tuder, [6] by Sisenna's mention of a separate grant of the *civitas* in 90 BC.⁹⁰

It will be expedient to discuss first of all the incorporations that can be proved and verified. Cicero in a fragment of the *Pro Vareno* describes *Fulginiae* as a *municipium*. He also calls it a *praefectura*.⁹¹ The term is significant. It shows that *Fulginiae* at some time or other in the past had been a community of imperfect autonomy on Roman territory, either a settlement of Roman citizens or a *civitas sine suffragio*. That it was the latter not the former is certain. An early inscription, in the Latin alphabet but in the

⁸⁹ See e. g. A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford 1939) 47–8 [= (Oxford 1973²) 50–1].

⁹⁰ Sisenna, F 119 Peter [= *FRHist* 26 F 78] (= Plin. *Nat.* 3.113).

⁹¹ *Gramm. Lat.* 7.14.70 [F 3 and 4 Crawford].

Umbrian language, reveals the presence at Fulginiae of the native magistrature, *marones*.⁹² That is to say, though the Romans deprived Fulginiae of its independence (as emerges from the fact that Fulginiae was a *praefectura*), they did not bother to interfere with its traditional institutions, but allowed its *marones* to go on, no doubt with lessened competence. As for Forum Flaminii, its origin is patent—a settlement established when the road was built, on territory taken from Fulginiae.

A peculiar type of magistracy, the octovirate, is found in the imperial age in certain Sabine communities, with a common history. They had all been incorporated in [7] the first instance with the *civitas sine suffragio*, advanced rapidly to the full citizenship, but continued to be *praefecturae*. *Octoviri* are attested at Amiternum, Trebula Mutuesca, and Nursia, also at Interamna Praetuttiorum, which, though geographically in south Picenum and included in Augustus' *Regio Quinta*, might not unreasonably be described as originally Sabine.⁹³ The *octoviri* have been the subject of prolonged discussion and sharp disagreement. One theory maintains that the octoviral order is a type of uniform municipal constitution imposed by the Roman government in *praefecturae* at a definite period in the third century BC. Such a view presupposes much more of plan and uniformity in Roman dealings with local affairs than is proved or plausible. There is more to be said for the traditional assumption that *octoviri* are an ethnic, or at least regional, form of magistracy, surviving where it had grown up and not disturbed by the central government. Who cared?

So far, only Sabine octovirates have been mentioned. But there were also *octoviri* at Plestia in Umbria, on the road between Fulginiae and Camerinum. This is very important. Not that it debilitates the view that *octoviri* [8] are an ethnic or regional phenomenon—it is by no means easy to distinguish what is Sabine from what is Umbrian, and Plestia is contiguous with the north of the Sabine country. Arguments depending on a presumed 'Umbrian' character are therefore invalid. The point is this: *octoviri* at Plestia provide a fair indication that Plestia was not a *civitas foederata* enfranchised in 90 BC, but had once been a *civitas sine suffragio*, that its history resembles that of the Sabine communities.⁹⁴

Plestia is therefore generally reckoned, along with Fulginiae and Forum Flaminii, as Roman territory before the *Bellum Italicum*. The evidence, though very strong, might, it is true, be held to fall short of absolute proof, especially if one is prepared to reckon with the existence of all sorts of anomalies. Allied states enfranchised in 90 BC become *municipia*, and the standard type for the

⁹² Vetter, *Handbuch* 234 [= *Imagines Italicae* Umbria/Fulginiae 1].

⁹³ Amiternum: *CIL* 9.4398 and 4400. Trebula Mutuesca: *CIL* 9.4119, 4883, 4891, 4896, 4897, 4899, etc. Nursia: 9.4543 (= *ILS* 6550), 4547 and 4549. Interamna: *CIL* 9.5067 (= *ILS* 5666).

⁹⁴ *CIL* 11.5621.

municipia is the quattuorvirate. But it would be a mistake to assume that constitutions with *IVviri* were immediately and uniformly imposed by the Roman government. That was not their way at all. Therefore, if other magistracies are attested for a time subsequently in one state or another, it does not follow that the community in question had not been a *civitas foederata*. A state allied [9] to Rome by an especially favourable form of treaty may have been permitted to retain its own type of local magistracy; and some, as the Latin civilisation spread, may already, by spontaneous choice, have modified the names and titles of their institutions. That is to say, *duoviri* as well as *marones* might have existed in Umbria before 90 BC. Survival and anomalies are only to be expected. If *marones* continue at Asisium after the enfranchisement, what more natural? There is a praetor at Hispellum; and Carsulae can show a *Ilvir iure dicundo* even in the time of Augustus.⁹⁵ Yet there is no reason for supposing that Asisium, Hispellum, and Carsulae had been incorporated before the *Bellum Italicum*.

Arguments from the tribes of the different Umbrian communities are peculiarly hazardous. One peculiar fact is the large number enrolled in the Clustumina and forming a continuous band of territory from south to north, first Interamna and Carsulae next, a whole string in western Umbria, in or adjacent to the valley of the Tiber—Ameria, Tudur, Vettona, Arna, Tifernum Tiberinum—and finally Tifernum Mataurense, Sestinum, and Pitinum Mergens. All, it is fair to conclude, had been *civitates foederatae*. Now one city, Tudur, showed recalcitrance at the time of [10] the *Bellum Italicum*. It has been contended that all the disloyal communities in Umbria were lumped together in the *Clustumina*.⁹⁶ In itself the contention did not lack plausibility, and the Roman treatment of certain of the *Italici* lent support—Marsi and Paeligni without exception in the tribe *Sergia*, five Samnite communities in the *Voltinia*; and six of the Lucanians in the *Pomptina*. None the less, it is not altogether easy to believe that this narrow and elongated zone corresponded precisely to the area of disaffection, or that the states involved were so numerous. Unlikely, again, is the participation of towns in the south like Interamna and Carsulae.

The rest of Umbria presents a strange mosaic in the Roman tribal system. The allied communities of which the tribe can be established number thirteen, from Oriculum in the south to Sarsina and Mevaniola in the far north. These thirteen are apportioned among no fewer than eight tribes. The contrast is striking. If these divergent patterns in electoral geometry cry out for an explanation, they cry in vain. Nobody would be prepared to contend that

⁹⁵ Hispellum: *CIL* 1².3382; Carsulae: *CIL* 11.4575.

⁹⁶ K. J. Beloch, *Der italische Bund unter Roms Hegemonie: Staatsrechtliche und statistische Forschungen* (Leipzig 1880) 38–43, 56–7; id., *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der punischen Kriege* (Leipzig and Berlin 1926) 578–9.

the apparently favoured cities in the eight tribes had all received the franchise before the *Bellum Italicum*, and there would be no point in speculating about the status [11] of any one of them. It may be put on record that Asisium, Oriculum, and Mevania have sometimes been taken for citizen communities before 90 BC.⁹⁷

Further, to pass on to places the site of which is known but not the tribe. Between Spoletium and Fulginiae lies Trebiae. It could have been incorporated at an early date. But there is no evidence, its history is a blank all through, and only Pliny's list shows Trebiae to have been a separate community in the time of Augustus.⁹⁸ Northward from Forum Flaminii towards the Pass of Scheggia the Via Flaminia passes first through Nuceria Camellaria, then through Tadinum. Some scholars claim that this tract was Roman territory in the third century BC.⁹⁹ Evidence there is none, only the fact of a Roman highway and a presupposition that turns out to be erroneous.

One is left with seven unidentified communities in Pliny's list, most of them, it may be presumed, small tribal remnants in the northwestern corner of Umbria near Sentinum and Sarsina; and Pliny also names a dozen that had perished and no longer existed when the Augustan lists were drawn up.¹⁰⁰ Speculation in this field would be unprofitable. But the enquiry should not close without reference to an enigmatic fact. The tribe of both [12] Carsulae and Tuder is the Clustumina. Yet the tribe Voltinia occurs with unexpected frequency on the territories of each state. Now sporadic immigrants with alien tribes may appear anywhere, and such are found in Umbrian cities, often deriving from neighbour communities. Thus men at Asisium with the tribe *Oufentina* may well be citizens of Forum Flaminii or Plestia. Similarly, the *Oufentina* is found at Trebiae (tribe unascertained)—but also the *Sergia* and the *Aemilia*, which are the tribes of Asisium and of Mevania respectively. The occurrences of the *Voltinia* at Carsulae and Tuder seem to belong to a different category. No known Umbrian city has the *Voltinia*, it is found only in Samnium and in Gallia Narbonensis. Furthermore, two inscriptions actually combine the tribe *Voltinia* with the *domus Tuder*. The conclusion is difficult to resist. Since the two men in question are enrolled as citizens of Tuder, more immigration does not explain the matter; and since the *Voltinia* occurs also on the territory of Carsulae, that phenomenon probably stands in relation. A hypothesis could cover the facts—there was once a community of citizen right on the Flaminia north of Carsulae (perhaps at or near Acquasparta) which was broken up and divided between Carsulae and Tuder. [13] Hence

⁹⁷ See e.g. Beloch, *Der italische Bund*, 57–8 (on Asisium); T. Frank, *Roman Imperialism* (New York 1914) 83.

⁹⁸ Plin. *Nat.* 3.114.

⁹⁹ See e.g. E. Bornmann, *CIL* 11, p. 823, 853 (on *CIL* 11.5802); Beloch, *Römische Geschichte*, 561.

¹⁰⁰ Plin. *Nat.* 3.114.

the possibility, but not the certitude, of a Roman settlement here, or a *civitas sine suffragio*, before 90 BC.

So far the attempt to define and circumscribe the area of the Roman annexations in Umbria. Apart from the two Latin colonies of Narnia and Spolegium, it appears to be limited to Forum Flaminii, Fulginiae, and Plestia. The names suggest roads and strategy—and not the Flaminia only, but a road of cardinal importance before the Flaminia was built.

Both Fulginiae and Plestia have something to do with the road to Camerinum. It would be well to know when and why these two communities, alone of the Umbrians, were deprived of autonomy and made subject to Rome, not allied. The annexation is generally assumed to belong to the period of the original Roman conquest of Umbria, towards 290 BC.¹⁰¹ It may be so. Yet there is a small difficulty. Autonomous units like Latin colonies need not be contiguous with Roman territory, and indeed might be established in remote regions. They are meant to stand by themselves. Patches of territory, inhabited by *cives sine suffragio*, are not quite the same thing. Fulginiae and Plestia seem to be hanging in the air. In 290 BC the nearest Latin colony is Narnia, a long way distant.

[14] It might be worth asking whether these annexations may not have taken place at a later date. Spolegium was not founded as a Latin colony until 241 BC. There is no knowing what the status of Spolegium had been since the Roman conquest of Umbria. Perhaps its territory had then been confiscated—and nothing else had been done for fifty years and more. There might be another explanation. No sooner had the First Punic War ended in 241 BC than the displeasure of the Romans fell heavily on one of the Italian allies at least, the city of Falerii on the southern border of Etruria. The last heard of the Faliscans was their defeat by the Romans in 293 BC.¹⁰² The expiry of a fifty years' treaty may have provoked friction—or provided the Romans with an excuse for intervention. It is asserted that the Faliscans raised rebellion. They were crushed in six days. Falerii lost half her dominion, the inhabitants were compelled to abandon their strong city on its rocky promontory defended by deep ravines (Civita Castellana), and occupy a new site in the open country four miles away (Santa Maria di Falleri). The Faliscans might have been reduced to the status of *cives sine suffragio*: it is more likely that they remained a *civitas foederata*. Such being the treatment meted out to Falerii, the [15] establishment of a Latin colony at Spolegium in the same year might represent the penalisation for unsatisfactory behaviour of another allied state—on the hypothesis that Spolegium had been an ally since the Roman settlement with the Umbrian peoples some fifty years earlier. An excuse to confiscate land would be welcome as provision for soldiers on the termination of the Punic

¹⁰¹ Cf. e.g. Beloch, *Römische Geschichte*, 500.

¹⁰² Livy 10.45.6, 46.10–15.

War. A Latin colony at Spolegium brought the Umbrian valley under Roman control—and Fulginiae and Plestia lay on the road to Camerinum. Incorporation through the partial franchise looks like a punishment. Its original nature seems different—rather a special kind of alliance. The earliest grant is expressly described as a favour and an honour. It was made to the knights of Capua for their loyalty to Rome at the time of the Latin War.¹⁰³ The same privilege was next accorded in 338 BC to the people of Fundi and Formiae—precisely, so Livy affirms, because of their service in keeping open the road into Campania.¹⁰⁴ On this parallel a strong case might be made for believing in an early grant to Fulginiae and to Plestia.

Twenty-one years after the establishment of Spolegium the Flaminia was constructed, and a small piece of land at Forum Flaminii was taken from Fulginiae. It would, [16] however, be hazardous to conjecture that the annexation of Fulginiae (and of Plestia) occurred as late as 220 BC—or 217 BC, as a punishment for disloyalty when Hannibal passed that way, marching through from Umbria into Picenum. It is not indeed recorded that Hannibal received help from any Umbrian communities. Fulginiae, in a later period at any rate, was not a fortress but an open town on the plain, unwallled, if Silius Italicus be credited—*patuloque iacens sine moenibus arvo*.¹⁰⁵ Its independent Umbrian predecessor may have occupied a defensible site.

To string conjecture on conjecture in this fashion is not a reassuring procedure. There is no other way, for the evidence is derisory—the bare recorded date of Spolegium, and inferences about the status of Fulginiae and Plestia before 90 BC. It will be expedient to emphasise yet again the uncertainties touching both the conquest of Umbria, Sabinum, and Picenum and the original organisation of those territories. In those uncertainties it seems reasonable to invoke the geography of communications and take into account the strategic needs of the Romans before the Flaminia provided the link between Rome and Ariminum. If, as is generally assumed, Fulginiae and Plestia were annexed at an early date, the road to [17] Camerinum is the best explanation. A paradoxical fact stands out. The Flaminia in all its course between Narnia and the boundary of the Roman territory in the *Ager Gallicus* touches Roman soil only at Forum Flaminii—the greater part of its course runs through allied states. The Latin colony of Spolegium is not on the Flaminia, while Fulginiae and Plestia seem to be related to the predecessor of the Flaminia, the road to Camerinum, giving transit both to Picenum and to the *Ager Gallicus*.

If this was the sum of the Roman annexations in Umbria, valid conclusions emerge about the general character of Roman foreign policy in the third century BC.

¹⁰³ Livy 8.11.16.

¹⁰⁴ Livy 8.14.10.

¹⁰⁵ Sil. *Pun.* 8.459: 'standing unwallled on the open plain'.

While the long process of the Samnite wars went on, the vicissitudes of the struggle involved various peoples and left Rome at the end of it all in 290 BC dominant in central Italy with the area of her territory and the sphere of her alliances vastly augmented. The structure of her power rested on a complex system of annexations, colonies, and alliances. With the Sabellic peoples, Marsi, Vestini, Paeligni, and Marrucini, Rome concluded alliances, to form a barrier against the Samnites as far as the Adriatic. Further north as a result of the campaign of M'. Curius (in 290 BC) the land of the Sabines and the [18] Praetuttii was conquered: the natives were incorporated with the status of *cives sine suffragio*, and two colonies were planted on the Adriatic, at Hadria and at Castrum Novum. Beyond lay the people of Picenum, in alliance since 299 BC. They are next heard of as being conquered in 268 BC. In the whole of this zone (Sabini, Praetuttii, and Picentes) the Romans do not seem to have carried out any extensive expropriations whether for colonies or for individual allotments, and before long the *cives sine suffragio* were promoted to the full franchise. They were enrolled in the tribes Quirina and Velina. According to the Livian epitome, those tribes were created in 241 BC.¹⁰⁶ No others were added ever after, and the total of the tribes reached thirty-five.

The enormous increase in the territory of Rome and in her citizen body must have made statesmen pause and think. To go further would strain the apparatus of government—and dilute the character of the *populus Romanus*. Incorporation therefore ceased, and the fabric of the Roman dominion in central Italy remained in essentials what it had been in 241 BC for a century and a half down to the *Bellum Italicum*.

[19] In so far as concerns the remaining regions, namely Etruria and Umbria, the decision had already been made. Though there had been wars against the Etruscans in the period 311–293 BC, those wars were not followed by annexations. It was only after some of the Etruscan cities made common cause with the Gauls in their great invasion of 285 BC that Rome took territory in Etruria, and it was only in the south. Vulci, Volsinii, and Caere were penalised.¹⁰⁷ For the rest, the states of Etruria passed intact into the Roman alliance. The Etruscans had a tradition of power and of empire. They were a distinct people and an alien people, and the Romans preferred that they should remain so. They were therefore segregated, as it were, in their own country, and left under the sway of their own laws and customs. The device of control through the partial franchise employed without hesitation among the Sabines, a kindred race and assimilable, would have been impracticable in Etruria: in fact, it was applied to one state only, Caere.

¹⁰⁶ Livy *Per.* 19.10.

¹⁰⁷ Vulci: Plin. *Nat.* 3.51 (*Cosa Volcentium*); Volsinii: Zonar. 8.7; Caere: Cass. Dio 10 F 33 with Zonar. 8.6.10.

The same objection would not have held for some at least of the Umbrians. They were akin to the Sabines, they were not recalcitrant to the Romans, they had no strong national or ethnic core of resistance. Perhaps [20] their very lack of unity enabled the Romans to pursue the policy of least trouble to themselves. Strategic reasons had much to do with the conquest of the Sabines all the way through to the Adriatic, and of Picenum too. Here a positive decision had to be made. Most of the Umbrians, however, had come quietly into the Roman alliance shortly before 290 BC, and behaved well thereafter. They did not endanger Roman communications with the *Ager Gallicus*, but formed a safe zone in the Roman system of alliances.

It has been argued above that the Roman annexations throughout Umbria were small in extent—two Latin colonies only and two communities incorporated with the partial franchise and no *ager publicus*, so far as is known. Roman forbearance was justified by the results. The old population survived for the most part in Sabinum and Picenum, in Umbria it was hardly disturbed at all. While Sabinum and Picenum were incorporated in the *populus Romanus*, the allied states in Umbria retained their autonomy and enjoyed a long period of peace and order under the Roman protectorate.

6. UMBRIA IN THE CIVIL WARS

[10]¹⁰⁸ The communities of Umbria passed quietly into the Roman alliance, and quietly they abode there for two centuries. As in the dealing with the Etruscan cities, Rome was averse from innovation or interference. Moreover, from the year 241 BC a limit seems to have been set to enfranchisement and incorporation in central Italy. At this time, if Livy is correct, two new tribes were created, the Quirina and the Velina, making thirty-five in all (and they were the last).¹⁰⁹ The Sabine country was enrolled in the one, Picenum in the other. The structure of the Roman power in respect of citizen territory, Latin colonies and allied status acquired a shape and definition that was to subsist, without modification of general policy and with no serious changes in detail, for a [11] full century and a half down to the insurrection of the Italians (91 BC).

Throughout this long period there is peace in Umbria. The Gallic invasion of 225 BC passed further west, and all that Umbria saw of the Hannibalic War was a few days' ravaging after the Battle of Trasimene where Hannibal marched through to Picenum. None of the Umbrians went over to him, and it would have been futile to attack their strong cities. No other invader was

¹⁰⁸ [The pages of the typescript of this chapter are numbered from 10 to 20.]

¹⁰⁹ Livy *Per.* 19.10.

seen south of the Apennines. The wars against the Cimbri and the Teutones may well have recalled to the Umbrians the memory of earlier wars against their hereditary enemies, reinforcing loyalty to Rome and helping to promote the sentiment of a common Italian unity under the leadership of Rome. It would be an anachronism, however, to fancy that all men in Umbria desired, or could even conceive, the kind of justification that was to come.

Protecting the Umbrians from the Gauls, Rome maintained a loose but adequate control over her Umbrian allies by supporting the aristocracies in the cities; and the local worthies for their part saw in the Roman hegemony a firm and friendly guarantee of their status and property. Diplomacy undermined any national resistance and precluded insurrections: it must be emphasised that Rome celebrated no triumphs over any people in Umbria except the Nahartes and the Sarsinates.¹¹⁰ Etruria may show a parallel. Livy tells how the Romans intervened at Arretium to preserve the rule of the Cilnii against the local plebs.¹¹¹

[12] Autonomy was guaranteed by treaty and respected by policy. No taxes, but only levies of troops, that arrangement suited the ruling class in Umbria; and there was probably a useful outlet for surplus when the Romans expelled the Senones from the *Ager Gallicus* between Ariminum and Ancona and when they spread up the wide lands of the Cisalpina. The one danger to stability came when agrarian reformers at Rome cast their eyes on land in the allied communities—a bait not only to the Roman poor, but an incitement to the proletariat throughout Italy. If the lower classes in Umbria might now be willing to be merged in the *populus Romanus*, the rich had every reason to cling to autonomy and treaty rights. Hitherto, it should seem, they had little to complain of—at least the only evidence preserved is Cato's reference to the operations of Roman moneylenders at Camerinum.¹¹² And it is not likely that many of the *domi nobiles* in Umbria, or, for want of matter, in Etruria, were eager to forfeit the comfort of their traditional estate for the dubious prizes of a political career in a city where nobles and plebs alike would scorn them as aliens and upstarts.

Not that the barrier guarding the Roman citizenship was insuperable to men of energy, talent, or high rank in their own communities. The Latin might migrate to Rome, and there exercise the full franchise, and the Italian might find ways of slipping in, especially if he could show services political or military [13] to the *populus Romanus* or exploit the gratitude of a patron in the Roman nobility.

Of Rome's allies, fighting tribes of the Apennines are the most conspicuous in the foreign wars, above all the Marsi; and Paeligni and Marrucini make a splendid showing at Pydna.¹¹³ Next to nothing is said all through about any of

¹¹⁰ *Inscr. It.* 13.1.72–3 (*Nequinates*, 299 BC); 74–5 (*Sassinates*, 266 BC).

¹¹¹ Livy 10.3.2, 5.13.

¹¹² Fest. 268.8–13 L.

¹¹³ Plut. *Aem.* 20.1–3.

the Umbrians. Yet the Camertes showed loyalty and alacrity, sending a volunteer cohort to serve under Scipio when he carried the war from Italy into Africa, and their valour is symbolised a century later under C. Marius.¹¹⁴ For service in the field the *imperator* gave the franchise to two whole cohorts from Camerinum. Individuals of note or merit also became his beneficiaries and his clients, a Matrinius from Spoletium and Annius from Iguvium.¹¹⁵ Certain local families of high birth and standing, the *domi nobiles*, may well have acquired the Roman citizenship before their towns were finally enfranchised. For example, the wealthy Roscii of Ameria, who were under the protection of the Metelli and other noble houses; and perhaps the Propertii of Asisium—at least, one of them has a tribe, the Fabia, which is not that of his city.¹¹⁶ For all that could be known, persons of this class might easily have migrated from Umbria to Rome in earlier ages when the relations between state and state were highly fluid, when the Roman aristocracy or some at least of its more alert and liberal members, welcomed [14] as an accession of strength the advent of their peers from other cities. The conjecture has even been broached that the Sempronii were originally Umbrian: its validity rests upon the cognomen *Tuditanus*, never satisfactorily explained, yet perhaps an indication of origin, from Tuder.¹¹⁷ Whatever be thought of matters so remote, the process in itself is clear and attested for other regions and other families. To take a house of more recent nobility, the Pompeii, one of whose branches rises to the consulate in 141 BC. They are patently alien, perhaps only a degree or two less so than the Etruscan Perperna, consul in 130 BC, whose father was alleged to have no title to the franchise.¹¹⁸ The power of the Pompeii, to judge by what is known of Pompeius Strabo, and his son Magnus, seems to be rooted in Picenum, and Picenum may well be the district of their origin. Yet Umbria is not wholly excluded. The tribe of the Pompeii is the *Clustumina*, common to many cities of Umbria. However, no city of Umbria was enrolled in the *Clustumina*, so far as is known, until 90 BC, whereas the Pompeii already carry that tribe in their *état civil*, some years earlier.¹¹⁹

Sporadic immigration of Umbrian notables will have had no great significance. The narrative must turn to the sudden and complete incorporation of all the Italian allies. If the gentry of Umbria were eager to enter the Roman Senate and [15] share in the political life of the capital (and of this there is no sign) or merely resentful at being excluded from the profits of empire (which is far from certain), the impulsion towards a change in the relations between the suzerain and the allies was not their worth. Quite the reverse. When certain

¹¹⁴ Livy 28.45.20.

¹¹⁵ Matrinius: Cic. *Balb.* 48–9. Annius: *Balb.* 46.

¹¹⁶ *CIL* 6.1501.

¹¹⁷ Cf. e.g. L. Müller, *C. Lucili Saturarum reliquiae* (Leipzig 1872) 236.

¹¹⁸ Val. Max. 3.4.5.

¹¹⁹ L. R. Taylor, *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic* (Ann Arbor 1960) 244–5.

men from Umbria and Etruria appeared in Rome in the course of the year 91 BC they came not to agitate for the franchise, but to raise protest against the activities of the tribune M. Livius Drusus, an aristocrat and also a demagogue, and they came at the express invitation of the Roman consuls.¹²⁰ No doubt there were men of substance and repute, and some perhaps already in possession of the citizenship through the patronage of Roman generals and politicians. Agrarian laws and the incorporation of the local poor threatened their local predominance as well as their ancestral estates.

The prime movers in the Italian insurrection were the Marsi—their leader Poppaedi Silo had been a friend and adherent of Drusus¹²¹—and it at once took the form of a war for liberty against the tyrant city, waged by the Apennine tribes, by the Samnites and the Lucanians, and very properly designated the *Bellum Italicum*.¹²² The Roman government soon offered the franchise to the loyal communities, the victories of Pompeius Strabo secured Picenum, and the insurgent *Italici* were [16] prevented from breaking through to raise Umbria and Etruria to their standard. Only slight disturbances are recorded in this part of the peninsula, perhaps local risings of the town or rural poor against the ruling class in the cities. There is a hint of more serious trouble at Tuder. A fragmentary sentence of the historian Cornelius Sisenna shows separate terms being granted to that city, presumably the sequel to revolt or recalcitrance.¹²³ The natural strength of Tuder and a martial tradition disposed it to the independence. Sisenna also said something about Iguvium. An embassy is mentioned.¹²⁴ If the city was restless, it may not have been eager to secede, but, on the contrary, hesitant to accept the franchise.

All Umbria now entered the Roman state. The first consequences were unhappy, and they came quickly. Before the *Bellum Italicum* had been properly disposed of, there was uproar in Rome—politicians competing for the support of the newly enfranchised citizens, generals eager for high command. Out of personal or partisan quarrels arose civil war. The party that had gathered around the name and prestige of C. Marius controlled Italy, though by no means the whole of it, for a few years until the *nobilis* came back under the leadership of Sulla, in 83 BC. The next year saw Etruria and Umbria as the main seat of the war, with desperate marches and countermarches for the control of the northern roads, and great battles at Clusium [17] and Spoletium. The Marian generals were overcome, the stronghold fell—and Marcus Crassus sacked Tuder.¹²⁵

To the ravages of war were added the penalties of defeat. Sulla the Dictator confiscated lands to reward the veterans. The details of his actual military

¹²⁰ App. BC 1.36. ¹²¹ RE XXII, 1, 78.

¹²² See e.g. Cic. *Clu.* 21, *Leg. Agr.* 2.80, *Arch.* 8.

¹²³ Non. 130 M. = 189 L. (= *FRHist* 26 F78).

¹²⁴ Non. 68 M. = 95 L. (= *FRHist* 26 F62).

¹²⁵ App. BC 1.89–90; Plut. *Crass.* 6.5.

colonies are obscure. In Umbria, none happens to be identifiable. A late author includes Spoletium along with Interamna among the *splendidissima Italiae municipia* that incurred the vengeance of Sulla.¹²⁶ The manner and degree of their punishment has not been recorded. Some of the towns no doubt enjoyed protection, or purchased it; and some of the local magnates were loyal to their ties with the Roman *nobilitas* or changed sides in time to safeguard their estates. Such was Roscius of Ameria, described as a person of distinction—and influence. The *municipium* of Interamna has left monumental expression of its gratitude to its *patronus*, the quaestor A. Pompeius: he had liberated and preserved the town from extreme danger and distress.¹²⁷

The ten years' war in Italy closed with the triumph of a party, with confiscation and murder. A certain Sex. Roscius of Ameria, a supporter of the *nobilitas*, so it is averred, and exultant in their victory, fell by the hand of an assassin at Rome. By birth, rank, and fortune he was by a long way the first man not only in Ameria but in all the country round. Members of the family had the dead man's name put on the proscription [18] list, so as to acquire his property easily and cheaply—Roscius owned no fewer than thirteen rich farms, most of them close to the river Tiber, and they tried to fix the guilt of the crime on Roscius' son.¹²⁸ Fortunately the young man was sheltered and succored by a lady called Caecilia Metella, some of the *nobiles* took an interest in a case that touched the duties and the prestige of their class, a promising advocate was secured, and justice triumphed in the eloquence of Cicero.¹²⁹

Another speech from Cicero's early career, the *Pro Vareno*, of which only fragments survive, gives more than a hint of the things that might go on in Umbria during or after the proscriptions.¹³⁰ L. Varenus was accused of contriving several murders—Pompulenus, Salarius, and one of his own name, C. Varenus, were the victims, while Cn. Varenus had been wounded. The person who set on foot the prosecution was C. Ancharius Rufus of the *municipium* of Fulginiae. The name *Varenus* is not merely Umbrian in type, but happens to be attested in an office-holding family at Fulginiae.¹³¹ This time Cicero was not successful, despite an oration of considerable power and skill. Varenus was condemned. One can only guess at some horrible and complicated game of greed, intrigue, and murder, with property for the prize in the fat lands between Fulginiae and [19] Mevania.

Sulla's victory and the order he established through violence and confiscation left bitter memories, and little gratitude even from those whom he preserved or enriched. The men of substance had every reason to fear lest the turbulent

¹²⁶ Flor. 2.9.27. ¹²⁷ CIL 11.4213 = ILS 6629.

¹²⁸ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 20. ¹²⁹ Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 27, 147.

¹³⁰ The fragments and *testimonia* of this speech are now conveniently collected in J. W. Crawford, *M. Tullius Cicero: The Fragmentary Speeches. An Edition with Commentary* (Atlanta 1994) 7–18.

¹³¹ CIL 11.5219 and 5220.

politics of the metropolis should again provoke civil war and revolution. They would have to pay the bill, wherever in the world the armed decision might fall. Of the condition of Umbria in the thirty years of precarious peace under the normal rule of the Roman oligarchy, there is one indication only, and it is highly significant. Camerinum, Rome's oldest ally in Umbria, was a centre of disturbance at the time of the Catilinarian affair; and it was a man of Camerinum whom Catilina sent into Picenum to organise partisans there.¹³²

When a generation elapsed after Sulla, the Marian cause revived. Caesar the proconsul won glory in Gaul and command of patronage, and the enemies of the Sullan system saw the chance to regain status, wealth, and power. As would be expected, Caesar's following was neither homogeneous nor wholly revolutionary: along with rogues and adventurers it embraced men of patrician family and comfortable bankers. Two elements in it, however, deserve especial attention, the survivors of defeated causes. First the *Italici*, the peoples of the central highlands from Picenum down to Samnium and Lucania, who had [20] risen against Rome only forty years before: members of the local aristocratic houses of *Italia* are conspicuous amongst the adherents of Caesar, to mention only the Marrucine C. Asinius Pollio. Secondly, the faction of Marius, which was especially strong in Etruria, Umbria, and Campania, with support both from old citizens and from new.

For this reason and for other reasons, notably the war plan of Pompeius Magnus, Caesar in his invasion won Italy without a battle. Minucius Thermus was stationed with five cohorts at Iguvium, flanking the Via Flaminia, the high road leading down from Ariminum, and Lucilius Hirrus held Camerinum with six, commanding the road from Picenum into Umbria.¹³³ But Thermus had to depart in some precipitation, his troops deserted, and the town went over with alacrity when Caesar's general turned up; and Lucilius Hirrus fled from Camerinum. Caesar marched down the coast, and there is no more news from Umbria. Caesar's strategy had a political root—in some towns and among some classes he could exploit powerful sentiments, not merely distaste for war and apathy towards the Roman oligarchy, but gratitude and revenge. One family at least among the notables of Iguvium, the Annii, had cause to remember C. Marius, the levy of Camerinum had been signalled for valour by the *imperator*, and Camerinum had been implicated in a subversive movement a dozen years before. Unscathed by Caesar's [21] invasion, and undisturbed at first when hostilities broke out after the assassination of the Dictator, save by local competition for recruits and partisans, in the *Bellum Mutinense*, Umbria soon experienced again its history of forty years before. The Caesarian leaders formed the Triumvirate, instituted the proscriptions—and provoked another civil war in Italy. As it was the purpose of the Triumvirs

¹³² Sall. *Cat.* 27.1.

¹³³ Caes. *BC* 1.12 and 15.

not merely to exact vengeance and crush opposition, but to extort money for the conduct of a campaign and the remuneration of their troops, they penalised neutrals as well as enemies, and the wealthy for preference. The lists of the proscribed no doubt included some opulent Umbrians. To provide land for the veterans after victory, the Triumvirs reserved eighteen of the most considerable cities of Italy. Six names are given by the historian Appian, others may be added by conjecture.¹³⁴ No Umbrian city happens to be among them. However that may be, when Octavianus after Philippi returned to carry out the expropriations, the landowners of Italy raised violent protest. The consul L. Antonius, the Triumvir's brother, came out on their side, dissension passed into open war, with Umbria the seat and centre of operation. The armies marched backwards and forwards across the land, fighting on in Sulla's war for the lines of communication with Gallia Cisalpina. One Umbrian city, Sentinum, was stormed in the early stages, but there was no great battle anywhere, [22] only a famous siege.¹³⁵ The generals from the north were unable to relieve the city, and L. Antonius capitulated. Though some of the captives, along with L. Antonius, were spared, a savage vengeance fell upon others, and Perugia perished in the flames.¹³⁶

The age of Sulla had come again, and again the land of Umbria knew what it meant to be involved with Roman generals. And there seemed no end. The next occasion, however, when Octavianus and M. Antonius went to war in 32 BC, if distasteful, turned out to be less painful. Force was applied by Caesar's heir to win a reluctant Italy, but there was no armed conflict on Italian soil. He required both material support and a national mandate for the war against the Queen of Egypt and her Roman ally. Levies of men and contributions in money were not enough. Manifestations and votes of confidence were organised everywhere, *tota Italia* took the oath of allegiance and called upon Caesar's heir to lead the nation to victory.

The plebiscite of *tota Italia* had no doubt been properly arranged by local magnates of the Caesarian faction, and the Antonians were silenced or intimidated. The process can easily be divined. Umbria might even supply a hint or a fact. It had already seen the beginnings at least of such an action. In the year 43 BC at the time of the War of Mutina, a knight [23] called Visidius threw himself with fervour into the cause of the Republic: he encouraged his neighbours to enlist, and he subsidised the poorer from his own funds. The name Visidius has non-Latin stigmata, and a deity called the *deus Visidianus* was worshipped at Narnia—clearly the god of the *gens Visidia*.¹³⁷ Visidius is the kind of man the Triumvirs might well have proscribed.

¹³⁴ Ancona: App. *BC* 5.23; Ariminum, Beneventum, Capua, Nuceria, Venusia: 4.3.

¹³⁵ App. *BC* 5.30; Cass. Dio. 48.13.4–6.

¹³⁶ Vell. 2.74.4; App. *BC* 5.49; Cass. Dio 48.14.5–6. Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 14–15.

¹³⁷ Tert. *Apol.* 24.

In the crisis of 32 BC, suitable persons were available, whether of ancient lineage or newly enriched by the Revolution. Camerinum is now in the allegiance of Caesar's heir: a dedication set up in this very year honours him as *patronus*. Elsewhere the identity of the men or families dominant in the cities may even be discoverable, for example at Spolegium and at Narnia. Chance reveals a fact about Iguvium. An inscription commemorates the benefactions of a local magistrate, Cn. Satrius Rufus, various sums he had paid towards the roads of the town.¹³⁸ Two items are significant—contribution to the support of the legions, and to the celebrations for the victory of Caesar Augustus.

To speculate about the cities of Umbria in the time of tribulation through the Triumvirate, the Proscriptions, the *Bellum Perusinum*, the *coniuratio Italiae*, and the settlement after the victory is an engaging pursuit, and not altogether fruitless. The subject of the military colonies of the [24] Triumvirs and of Augustus is highly obscure, it is true. Something may be said about two cities, Hispellum and Tuder, which emerge from the turmoil with the title *colonia Iulia*, proving that the colonies were established before 27 BC. Of Hispellum, there is no record in history before the time of Augustus: it may well have benefited by land taken from its neighbour Asisium. The colony received from Augustus the charge of a noted beauty spot, the *fons Clitumni* in the valley between Spolegium and Fulginiae. It may—or may not—have belonged to Spolegium. If it did, Augustus' action may exhibit, not so much a penalisation of Spolegium as an especial sign of regard for a colony Augustus had himself founded. As for Tuder, now styled *Iulia fida*, neither epithet proves that Augustus was the sole author of the colony (the name of Antonius has a tendency to be supposed), or that Tuder's allegiance had been single and satisfactory all through.¹³⁹ Though Italy's leader, when the oath was imposed in 32 BC, might advertise a certain delicacy, exempting as he did Bononia, which was in the *clientela* of the Antonii, evictions were certainly carried out after the Battle of Actium, and the inhabitants of disaffected towns were sent abroad.¹⁴⁰ A body of colonists at Tuder drawn from Augustus' *legio XXXXI* set up a dedication in honour of one of their military tribunes; and a centurion of the legion, who had served at sea, has left his gravestone on Tudertine territory.¹⁴¹

Those veterans might have been established there after the [25] Battle of Actium. Tuder may have been Antonian in sympathy. There is no means of knowing. Augustus, so he records, paid money for lands he took in Italy.¹⁴² The evidence about confiscation and settlement in Umbria even if supplemented by a few odd items, is hardly adequate to support valid conclusions or give a fair picture of what happened either after Perugia or after Actium.

¹³⁸ CIL 11.5820 = ILS 5531.

¹³⁹ CIL 11.4646.

¹⁴⁰ Bononia: Suet. Aug. 17.3. See Vell. 2.85.2; Cass. Dio 51.4.6.

¹⁴¹ CIL 11. 4650 = ILS 2230; CIL 11.4654 = ILS 2231.

¹⁴² RG 16.1.

One stray fact may conceal a story about the vicissitudes of Mevania. The citizens of that town solemnly consecrated a burial place for one of their number, T. Resius, and his descendants for ever, in recognition of his many services.¹⁴³ The services are not specified—they were presumably something superior to mere financial assistance. Nor is any local magisterial rank given to Resius, but only the title *legatus pro praetore*. Resius may have been active in this region as a land-commissioner at some time or other in the revolutionary period—one of Caesar's agents in Etruria had that title. If so, he was in a position to help his native city. It would not, however, be legitimate to take an official dedication in honour of a mandatory of the central government as proof of nothing but sincere and unalloyed gratitude. If Resius' duty and office was the confiscation of property, he might have deserved hatred no less than thanks. Asinius Pollio, conducting that operation in the Cisalpina after the Battle of Philippi, [26] may have been honoured with dedications of gratitude by the citizens of Mantua or Patavium. But there is no need to deal further in conjectures. The Propertii are the primary piece of knowledge, an ancient office-holding family at Asisium. The citizens had seen from their ramparts the doom of their neighbour Perusia, only ten miles away. The war claimed among its victims a kinsman of the poet;¹⁴⁴ and his ancestral estates, rich ploughland in the plain beneath the high city, were not spared.¹⁴⁵ Propertius published the first volume of his poems three or four years after the Battle of Actium. It contains no hint of Italy's leader, his victory over Antonius, the reconquest of the eastern provinces and kingdoms, the glorious triple triumph of 29 BC. All that the book says about war and politics is summed up in the last two poems, and their subject is Perusia and the sorrows of Italy:

*Italiae duris funera temporibus.*¹⁴⁶

Though the book quickly brought its author to the notice of the alert and discerning Maecenas, he was slow to respond to solicitation and guidance, letting many years elapse before he undertook to celebrate Roman antiquities and Roman history. The reluctance of Propertius, his tardy awakening to the august themes of contemporary history, is in marked contrast to the enthusiasm of other writers. Virgil and Livy bring the patriotism [27] of the new Italy of the north, a colonial and frontier zone. Umbria was a land of old civilisation, it had not been touched or stirred by the wars of the Republic against foreign enemies. Propertius could not feel the call of *tota Italia* as did the Transpadane Italians. Rather, he represents a defeated class, an Umbrian noble remembering Perusia as the *nobiles* of Rome remembered Philippi. But Propertius is also a document of acquiescence in the new order of things, or a symbol of the reconciliation between a conquered Italy and the imperial city.

¹⁴³ CIL 11.5029.

¹⁴⁴ Prop. 1.21.

¹⁴⁵ Prop. 4.1.128–31.

¹⁴⁶ Prop. 1.22.4: ['the burial place of Italy in hard times'].

The unity of Italy, ostensibly brought into being by the extension of the Roman franchise and tirelessly proclaimed by politicians in the closing age of the Republic, is only achieved through the violent processes of war and revolution and first reveals its authentic shape and substance when the monarchy is born. The victory of Caesar Augustus, it may with truth be contended, turns out also, and not least to be the victory of the non-political classes.

On that definition, Umbria is a prime beneficiary of the new order. Receptive to the civilisation of Etruria and submissive to the armed power of the *Populus Romanus*, the aristocracy of Umbria dwelt apart, comfortable and at peace, in enjoyment of their own customs, laws, and local predominance for two centuries until they were rudely projected into Roman dissensions [28] and abruptly incorporated. Hitherto there had been no conspicuous migration of Umbrian notables to Rome, the first consequences they experienced in the enfranchisement were deplorable, and they may have shown little alacrity, or even aptitude, to benefit from the advantages of their new status. If the citizenship was a necessary qualification for advancement in Roman life, its bare possession took a man nowhere unless he had energy or wealth, standing or favour.

Between Plautus and Propertius, no man from Umbria bridges a long gap; and Plautus himself should properly be regarded as an erratic phenomenon, not as a document and witness of high civilisation in remote parts. Cicero in his *Brutus*, in a full catalogue of orators, can include representatives from the Latins and the allies among those he recalled from personal acquaintance or had heard about from men of the previous generation. No Umbrian is among them, and it is not until he comes to his own contemporaries that he can name a man from this region—and it is not a wholly authentic Umbrian, but a citizen of the old Latin colony of Spoletium.¹⁴⁷

The question of language is highly relevant, perhaps [as much as?] that of nationality. How quickly the native dialect or dialects gave way before Latin, there is not the available evidence to determine. Various factors operated—the service of Umbrian levies and the existence of trunk roads like the Flaminia across the [29] Umbrian country—and the process went steadily on of economic and cultural unification, to be accelerated by civil war. A strong national tradition or a native literature kept Oscan alive for a long time in part of Campania and Samnium; and peoples like the Paelignians were not easily permeable. Umbria has nothing comparable. Like the Etruscans, the Umbrians held aloof from the *Bellum Italicum*; though they fought Sulla, they did not resist with the pertinacity shown by many cities of the proud Etruscans, notably Volaterrae, which raised an army of four legions and stood a siege of two years. Despite a general inclination to the Marian cause, the

¹⁴⁷ Cic. *Brut.* 271 (P. Cominius).

Umbrians do not look like determined partisans, and such evidence as has been collected about the allegiance of cities or individuals in that civil war, and in next, a generation later, may be misleading, if the limitations on knowledge are not taken into the account. Besides adherents of Marius there were no doubt clients of the Pompeii and of the older houses.

The civil wars cut across the ties of city, family, and class, with good men and bad, rich and poor on different sides. It would be hazardous, for example, to rely much on the only facts discoverable about Urbinum in this age—a bankrupt partisan of Marcus Antonius and a soldier who was promoted to equestrian rank through the patronage of Octavianus. And there is a large question that goes begging all through. How far is it justifiable, how is it profitable, to talk of Umbria as [30] though it were an entity. What of divergent fixtures created by the structure of the land and the process of history? Had the different cities and tribes developed in the same way and towards a unity of character during the two centuries of their individual existence as allies of the Roman People?

Different regions can be distinguished—the valley of the Nar, open to influences from Rome and from the Sabine country, the western zone bounded, but not sharply, by the Tiber from Etruria, the long central plain running round from Spoletium in the direction of Perusia, the tract beyond the main chain of the Apennines, with Camerinum, Matilica, and Tuficum facing Picenum eastwards, the northern hill of the Sarsinates country shading off into the Roman colonial territory in the *Ager Gallicus* or looking towards the Aemilia. Though the Umbrian peoples had been penned within those limits by the pressure of their neighbours, it does not follow that the population was homogeneous in origin—Ilyrian and Celtic elements can be detected, Sabine surmised (if Sabine could be clearly separated from Umbrian), and also Etruscan. Moreover, cities developed early in some regions, in others tribal units persisted for long ages. Lastly, there were two patches of territory that Rome had annexed (Fulginiae and Plestia); and, much more important, two cities of the South were Latin colonies. Internal conditions in Latin colonies, and especially the relations between colonists of the Latin right and the original [31] inhabitants on the territory, are a lost chapter of history, and a very important one. If Umbrians became Latinised, then colonists for their part might here as elsewhere be susceptible to native influences of various kinds. It is necessary to regard Narnia and Spoletium in isolation from the allied states of Umbria before the enfranchisement of Italy, and it will be expedient to treat them separately, at least for the first generation thereafter. The distinction though no doubt a matter of jealous pride, to citizens of Narnia and Spoletium, cannot have continued to count for much after that. Far greater distinctions were broken down by the revolutionary wars, and the loyalties that subsist in the *tota Italia* of Caesar Augustus have cities for their object rather than regions.

None the less, it will be convenient and even legitimate for certain purposes to look upon Umbria as a unit. The fact that Umbria, within its historical boundaries, goes along with the *Ager Gallicus*, a related territory, to form the Sixth Region in Augustus' division of Italy might seem to deserve emphasis. It does not. If Augustus showed some regard for history and tradition, the actual boundary he chose was devoid of political significance, for the regions had no political function whatsoever. There is something else. The old racial amalgam in Umbria when it came into the Roman alliance [32] persisted with little change under Republic and Empire. As in Etruria, there had been very little expropriation after the original conquest; and, despite the consequences of defeat in civil war, Umbria seems, comparatively speaking, to have suffered less than might have been expected: the lot of Etruria was much harder. Everything goes to show that the ruling class in Umbria was a fairly close order. Though official language knew only cities of peoples in the alliance of Rome, what really matters all through is the dynastic families, the *domi nobiles*. One of the cities, indeed, Attidium, seems to be precisely the seat of the family called Attidii; others may have had a similar baronial origin. At Asisium the names on early lists of magistrates indicate that power was concentrated in the hands of a few families—and the old names survive.

The study of nomenclature reveals astonishing facts, not isolated but widespread, and even constant. A large number of *gentilicia* are peculiar to Umbria, and some of them are indigenous to certain cities, with no attestation elsewhere, save perhaps casually at Rome, where all things go, or carried to a province by some trader or soldier. On the other hand, and confirmatory, few names of extraneous origin, or deriving from grants of the citizenship by the dynasts Pompeius, Caesar, Antonius, and by the Emperors.

[33] Though the Umbrians are not a nation, though the political units in Italy as a whole are not regions but the individual communities, it has been found practicable to write of Umbria as standing for something more substantial than a geographical expression. So far the enquiry has been concerned in the main with the political relations between the Umbrian cities and the Roman People down to the time of Augustus. Scraps of fragmentary evidence from the literary authorities have been employed, almost exclusively, odd items about men and cities, and the result is far from satisfactory. Cannot this slender construction get body and support from other kinds of history, economic for example?

Strabo the geographer furnishes a useful account of Umbria together with that ancient Umbrian territory, the *Ager Gallicus*.¹⁴⁸ He builds it up around the Flaminia, all the way from Ariminum down to Oriculum. As a whole, the land is fertile, he says, but rather mountainous, better for spelt than for wheat;

¹⁴⁸ Strabo 5.2.10.

certain towns along the Flaminia have grown populous by reason of the road. The geographer mentions a number of cities on the Flaminia or on either side of it. Details from Strabo, from Pliny the Elder and from the poets might be brought together and added up to exhibit a list of Umbrian products—the cheese of Sarsina, wine from Tuder or Spoletium, wooden barrels from Nuceria, the apples and pears of Ameria, sleek [34] bulls from Mevania, and what not.¹⁴⁹ A mere catalogue compiled from such sources, while listing commodities of especial or traditional notoriety, tells nothing about the economic condition of a region at any time. Nor are monumental remains an unequivocal indication of prosperity when region is compared with region, city with city. There are many hazards, many disturbing factors. The same holds for inscriptions. Yet the evidence from Asisium is impressive in bulk and quality; and one might be disposed to accord some significance to the epigraphical wealth of Spoletium, the dearth at Narnia and Carsulae—especially when there are independent reasons for risking conjecture about the vicissitudes of those cities under the Empire.

It would be more valuable to have information about wealthy families or owners of land. The direct evidence from the literary sources is deplorably scanty. The farms possessed by Roscius of Ameria are a welcome piece of knowledge; and in the imperial age one observes with gratification that Pompeia Celerina, the mother of Pliny the Younger's first wife, owned estates at Oriculum, Narnia, Carsulae, and Perusia.¹⁵⁰ Pompeia Celerina was not, so far as is known, of Umbrian extraction; and Pliny, who himself owned land further north, at Tifernum Tiberinum, an inherited property, was a Transpadane, from Comum.¹⁵¹ But if it were possible to nail down and identify [35] some Umbrians of rank and consequence, the result would have some relevance to economic history, as demonstrating the existence of prosperous families. A seat in the Roman Senate, is proof, not of sudden enrichment but respectable and inherited opulence. The *boni viri et locupletes* from various parts of Italy and the provinces in turn illustrate by the ratio of their frequency the material prosperity enjoyed by their native regions or towns several generations earlier.

That is to say, though the crude facts of agriculture and commerce are not to be had, though the men of property themselves, if they happen to speak, are, like Pliny, most delicate and evasive, it would suffice to establish their identity. In the aristocracy of the Umbrian cities there occur *gentilicia* of a rare and unmistakable type. A thorough enquiry might utilise these instructive names.

As has been shown, the Umbrians take a long time to make their presence felt in the Roman State. If the Latin colonies are left out of the reckoning, hardly any individuals specifically designated as Umbrian emerge between the

¹⁴⁹ T. Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, V (Baltimore 1940) 124, 162.

¹⁵⁰ Plin. *Ep.* 1.4.1.

¹⁵¹ Plin. *Ep.* 3.19.7, 5.7.4.

age of C. Marius and the Battle of Actium, they do not seem to be persons of any great consequence in themselves, and their notoriety is accidental. It might be possible to recover a name or two among the partisans of Marius and Caesar, among the new senators of the late Republic and of the revolutionary [36] age. Sulla, to make up the total of six hundred, must have admitted some new men from the towns, and Caesar the Dictator, augmenting the size of the Roman Senate still further, brought in men from all over Italy, including the Transpadane zone—and even provincials from Gallia Narbonensis and from Spain. Perpetuated by the Triumvirs, his work was completed by Caesar Augustus, whose aim it was to reinforce the harmony of the propertied classes, to make political life at Rome safe, reputable, and attractive for the country gentry.

In the early Empire as in the late Republic, a large number of senators never yet mentioned at all—at any one time something like a third part of the high assembly, perhaps even a half. These are quiet municipal men, with no prospect of fame or high office. The consulates of *novi homines*, though sometimes indicative only of the energy of an individual, will often attest the advance of a city or a region as well as a family in the social and political hierarchy. If Spolegium and Narnia lead the way in the Triumviral period, then Umbrian cities will no doubt follow in due course, in the years of peace and ordered government.

Umbrian towns, and especially the small communities in the north, make a strong and steady contribution to the Praetorian Guard and to the officer corps of the Roman Empire: the evidence is clear, for origins are registered on the documents. To certify senators is another matter. None [37] the less, nomenclature and relationships may be expected to yield valuable results, though fragmentary; and persons of some note may well be identifiable in the course of the first century or so after the founding of the Monarchy. Perhaps the peak will be reached in the time of the Flavian emperors.

7. POLITICAL PARTISANS FROM SPOLETIUM

The history of Spolegium in its relation to roads and campaigns has already been discussed. A prosperous city is a basis for power in peace as well as in war. The men of wealth and standing guide the affairs of the local governments, determine their allegiance, and throw their resources into the scale of Roman politics. The *domi nobiles* are by definition influential, through their repute and alliances, not only in their towns but in all the country around. They were bound by ties of friendship to the Roman nobles and their aid was invoked by Roman politicians even when their communities had not been incorporated in the Roman State. Thus the party of Scipio Aemilianus used

men from the allied states and men of the Latin name against the faction of the Gracchi.¹⁵² Reasonably enough, for the activities of the reformers went beyond the sphere of Roman politics and touched the interests of Italy as a whole. Persons of the same class and type were persuaded to exert their influence at Rome in the year 109 BC, when certain of the *nobiles* had reason to fear the damaging revelations of a commission of enquiry [2] on foreign affairs.¹⁵³ Finally, in 91 BC the consuls brought some of the notables of Etruria and Umbria to Rome, so that they might testify against the proposal of the tribune M. Livius Drusus.¹⁵⁴

Enfranchised at the time of the *Bellum Italicum*, Spolegium became an integral part of the *Populus Romanus*. Its political rôle in the next sixty years would be well worth knowing. Investigation might throw up some casual but significant facts about the activities of men from Spolegium, and even disclose a hint or two about their relations with Roman parties and party leaders. At first sight the harvest is rather meagre. Nobody of any social distinction seems discoverable, but only small men. When Cicero in 80 BC undertook the case of Sex. Roscius of Ameria, defending the young man against the machinations of members of his own family (not to mention a freedman of Sulla the Dictator), the prosecutor was a certain C. Erucius.¹⁵⁵ Cicero calls him a low fellow and casts doubt on the legitimacy of his birth: which may, or may not, have been justifiable. Now Erucius was also the prosecutor in another Umbrian murder trial that probably occurred not long after, the case of Varenius of Fulginiae.¹⁵⁶ The name Erucius is not at all common. A C. Erucius is [3] attested as a magistrate at Spolegium:¹⁵⁷ perhaps the same man, or a member of the same family.

Cicero in his defence of Roscius made an eloquent protest against the abuses and scandals which the dictatorship encouraged. His action was not as bold as it appears on the surface of things—the advocate was supported in court by the presence of certain *nobiles*, anxious to maintain the dignity of their class and the validity of their *clientela*. None the less, there is every reason for emphasising the ties which bound Cicero himself to the party that had been defeated by Sulla and the *nobiles*. He was a municipal man, from Marius' own town, and one of his relatives had been a prominent party member. While Sulla yet lived, Cicero defended a woman from Arretium, which city along with Volaterrae the Dictator had disenfranchised for its pertinacious adherence to the Marian cause.¹⁵⁸ Her name is not given. In another place it is recorded that he acted as *patronus* for a woman called Titinia.¹⁵⁹ The name Titinius is fairly common,

¹⁵² App. BC 1.19.

¹⁵³ Sall. Jug. 40.2.

¹⁵⁴ App. BC 1.36.

¹⁵⁵ Cic. Rosc. Am. 35, 38, 39, 42, 44, 50, 52, 55, 58, 61, 62, 72, 73, 78–80, 82–3, 89–90, 91, 101, 104, 122, 127, 132.

¹⁵⁶ Prisc. Inst. Gramm., *Grammatici Latini* 2.112.20 = F 10 Crawford.

¹⁵⁷ CIL 11.4800.

¹⁵⁸ Cic. Caec. 97.

¹⁵⁹ Cic. Brut. 217.

especially in Etruria, and the suggestion has been put forward that Titinia is no other than the Arretine woman.¹⁶⁰ This cannot be.¹⁶¹ [4] It must be admitted that Titinii are so numerous in this period as to discourage speculation, and it is barely worth the mention that there had been a Titinius of Minturnae whose wife sheltered Marius in 87 BC when he fled from Rome and lurked in the marshes of the river Liris.¹⁶²

The victory of the *nobiles* did not avail to destroy or discredit the Marian cause in the *municipia* of Italy: its strength, and especially in Etruria, is shown by the revolution of M. Lepidus in 77 BC. Though Etruria was crushed again, powerful resources of votes and of sentiment lay ready for a rising politician to work upon. Cicero's early intervention on behalf of the woman of Arretium is notable. Later, when his career as an advocate and as a senator was in favourable progress he defended A. Caecina of Volaterrae. Caecina's lineage was the most illustrious not only in Volaterrae but in a wide region of Etruria, he was a client well worth the trouble quite apart from any connections with the Marian party.

Another case, involving a small man, may be more instructive. Cicero had his eye on the praetorship of 66 BC. Eagerly pushing his career in a manner by no means acceptable to the chief men of the oligarchy, he [5] undertook the case of a certain Matrinius (68 or 67 BC). Little profit or credit was to be got out of this person—he was merely a scribe, a *homo tenuis*. It will be noted that T. Matrinius of Spoletium had been a client of Marius; and the help duly rendered by the *imperator* to T. Matrinius was thought worth commemorating by Cicero himself many years later in the speech *Pro Balbo* (56 BC).¹⁶³ The name Matrinius is not at all common, but it happens to be attested in Etruria and in Picenum as well as at Spoletium. Indeed, a local family in Southern Etruria gave its name to a village between Sutrium and Forum Cassii, precisely *Vicus Matrini*. Certainty is therefore precluded. Yet it may well be that Marius' client and Cicero's belong to one and the same family, from Spoletium.

None of the Matrinii came to anything—perhaps the Spoletine Matrinii had been brought low by the victory of the Sullan party and never recovered. Nor, for that matter, does any Titinius. But it does not follow that Cicero's actions proceeded from pure benevolence—or earned no political increment. A *novus homo* intent on the praetorship and the consulate could not afford to neglect any opportunity to exert *industria*, oblige men of every estate from high to low—and advertise loyalty [6] to a defeated but resurgent cause, that of Marius and the *municipia*. A patrician who grasped the advantage in that field was

¹⁶⁰ *RE* VI A, 1553, no. 26.

¹⁶¹ The following text has been crossed out immediately afterwards: 'In the Arretine case Cicero had to contend against the powerful advocacy of C. Aurelius Cotta, whereas they stood on the same side defending Titinia.'

¹⁶² *Plut. Mar.* 38.3–5.

¹⁶³ *Cic. Balb.* 48.

Julius Caesar, delivering a funeral oration on the widow of Marius and setting up his trophies in public again.¹⁶⁴

In the advocate's profession Spolegium can show representatives of its own. There were two brothers, Gaius and Lucius Cassius, Roman knights in station and fairly reputable. Together they prosecuted the notorious C. Staienus and secured his conviction (soon after 74 BC). Together again they launched on a bold line of conduct in 66 BC, starting a prosecution for *maiestas* against C. Cornelius, the popular tribune of the previous year.¹⁶⁵ The proceedings were broken up by violence and intimidation. The brothers took refuge on a staircase, waited till night fell, and made off along the rooftops. But they did not escape suspicion of collusion, and so, to clear their reputation, P. Cominius took up the case again in 65 BC. He had the support of the leading men of the oligarchy incensed against Cornelius, the adherent of Pompeius Magnus; but Cornelius' advocate was Cicero, and Cornelius was acquitted. Cominius' speech, so a sensible critic affirms, had some merit.¹⁶⁶ Cicero later in his *Brutus* gives Cominius [7] a brief notice of amity and approbation—an indication that he had not been a partisan of Caesar.¹⁶⁷ The Cominii were not, however, persons of any standing or consequence. They are small fry on the edge of politics, comparable to another pair of municipal orators, the Caepasii. The Caepasii popped up from nowhere and actually thrust themselves into the quaestorship.¹⁶⁸

The only senator from Spolegium who can be identified in the last age of the Republic is T. Furfanius Postumus. One of the jurymen at the trial of Milo, he had previously incurred the hostility of Clodius, who threatened to deposit a corpse in his house.¹⁶⁹ In 50 BC Furfanius was acting governor of Sicily, presumably either quaestor or proquaestor.¹⁷⁰ Whatever his previous allegiance, Furfanius next turns up as a Caesarian, governing the same province again in 45 BC.¹⁷¹ The name 'Furfanius' is exceedingly rare, and no Furfanius is attested before or after in the ranks of the Senate or even of the equestrian order. The fact of a T. Furfanius magistrate at Spolegium suffices to render plausible the local origin of the *gens*.¹⁷²

A *municipium* may contribute to the Roman army a handsome batch of officers, centurions, and common soldiers. In the legions which political generals levy and exploit for their [8] own ambitions, the centurions are their principal agents, won and incited by a strong chance that they will augment both their property and their status through devoted service to the *imperator*. Perhaps the most famous of the Caesarian centurions was C. Crastinus, whose name adorns all accounts of the Battle of Pharsalus, not

¹⁶⁴ Eulogy: Suet. *DJ* 6.1–2. Trophies: Vell. Pat. 2.43.4; Suet. *DJ* 11.

¹⁶⁵ Cic. *Brut.* 271; Asc. 59.14–60.8; Quint. *Inst.* 5.13.25. ¹⁶⁶ Asc. 61.24–62.2.

¹⁶⁷ Cic. *Brut.* 271. ¹⁶⁸ Cic. *Brut.* 242. ¹⁶⁹ Cic. *Mil.* 75.

¹⁷⁰ Cic. *Att.* 7.15.2. ¹⁷¹ Cic. *Fam.* 6.8.9. ¹⁷² *CIL* 11.4804.

omitting Lucan's epic.¹⁷³ Crastinus was a *primipilaris*, having served in the Tenth Legion. He leapt into the battle with a stirring appeal for victory or death—'the last battle of all', he cried, 'for Caesar's *dignitas* and our *libertas*'—and fell fighting.¹⁷⁴ The *gentilicium* 'Crastinus' is so rare as to be almost unique. The only other example of it in all the land of Italy occurs on an inscription found in hilly inaccessible country near Ferentillo, about twelve miles south-east of Spolegium.¹⁷⁵ Unfortunately this site, though north of the river Nar, probably does not belong to the territory of Spolegium, and other inscriptions show the tribe of the settlement as the Quirina, that is to say, it should be Sabine.¹⁷⁶

Yet a link may be discovered after all between Caesar and Spolegium. An inscription in lettering of Republican date records a dedication set up by a local senate to a [9] person called 'C. Oppius'.¹⁷⁷ Oppii are frequent in other parts of Italy, but not with the *praenomen* 'Gaius', and it has been conjectured that this C. Oppius is no other than Caesar's faithful adherent and political agent.¹⁷⁸ The relation seems to go back a long way, at least to the first year of Caesar's command in Gaul.¹⁷⁹ After the Ides of March, Oppius at once attached himself, along with Cornelius Balbus from Gades, to the fortunes of Caesar's heir. A stray fact could support the conjecture: the presence of Octavianus at Spolegium is certified, precisely on January 7, 43 BC.¹⁸⁰ It would only be fair to recall, however, that Caesar's friend might have come from Beneventum, or might be one of the Oppii of Auximum in Picenum.¹⁸¹

If Oppius be ruled out, the Caesarian partisan C. Calvisius Sabinus can provide the link. *Consul ordinarius* in 39 BC, he stands out as one of the most prominent of Octavianus' marshals, for a short time (38–36 BC) second only to Agrippa, until he was outdistanced by Statilius Taurus. About the local origin of Calvisius Sabinus, the field is still open to conjecture. Something better than conjecture can be offered. Statilius Taurus appears to derive his name and family from Lucania. There is not merely a dedication to him at the town of Volceii.¹⁸² The [10] *gentilicium* occurs in earlier history—Statius Statilius, the leader of an army of Lucanians and Bruttians, defeated by a Roman consul in the year 282 BC, and the commander Marius Statilius who served Rome well in the campaign of Cannae.¹⁸³ Like other magnificent upstarts of the Revolution, Taurus may come of an Italian dynastic stock. How close a parallel is Calvisius?

To connect him with the southern and south-eastern regions of Italy, there is nothing of decisive weight. One of the Calvisii Sabini, it is uncertain which,

¹⁷³ RE IV, 2, 1681. ¹⁷⁴ Caes. BC 3.91.2. ¹⁷⁵ CIL 11.4988.

¹⁷⁶ CIL 9.4990 and 4992. ¹⁷⁷ CIL 11.4812.

¹⁷⁸ RE XVIII, 1, 730–1, no. 9. ¹⁷⁹ Cf. RE XVIII, 1, 730, no. 9.

¹⁸⁰ Plin. Nat. 11.190; cf. Suet. Aug. 95.2; Cass. Dio 46.35.4.

¹⁸¹ RE XVIII, 1, 742–3, no. 24 and 744, no. 28. ¹⁸² ILS 893a.

¹⁸³ RE IIIA, 2, 2186, no. 9 and no. 7 respectively.

was *patronus* of the town of Canusium in Apulia.¹⁸⁴ That is all. Nor are the statistics about the distribution of the name 'Calvisius' in Italy valid to establish a local origin. One turns to Spolegium. A dedication at Spolegium bears witness to the *pietas* of C. Calvisius Sabinus—surely the great Caesarian partisan, consul in 39 BC.¹⁸⁵ Further, two fragmentary inscriptions from that municipality reveal persons called 'Calvisius'.¹⁸⁶ One, it is true, is a magistrate. But there is no indication of date or period, and Calvisii at Spolegium might be of freedman extraction, deriving their name ultimately from the *patronus* of Spolegium, who may well have acquired property there as well as the gratitude and respect which his title attests.

[11] Nor would it suffice to discover links between the senatorial Calvisii and citizens of Spolegium. A certain L. Ausidius Montanus, buried at Herculaneum, is described on his gravestone as *comes C. Calvisi Sabini*.¹⁸⁷ The man's tribe is the *Horatia*, precisely the tribe of Spolegium. Nomenclature will confirm the attribution. The *gentilicium* 'Ausidius' is exceedingly rare. Only one other instance seems to be known: it occurs on an inscription of Spolegium.¹⁸⁸

Another piece of fortuitous evidence, however, supplies just what is wanted. An inscription of Cyzicus far away in the province of Asia records a building dedication of a certain C. Calvisius Silo.¹⁸⁹ His quality is not stated, but his tribe is, the *Horatia*, and that is enough. The man might, or might not, be a Calvisius from Spolegium. It does not matter. If he is an alien whose family got the franchise from one of the senatorial Calvisii, that is enough. In the early Principate new citizens in the eastern lands quite often attest their benefactor by possession of his tribe as well as his *nomen*. Thus certain Greek Ummidii in the island of Cyprus show the *Teretina*.¹⁹⁰ The derivation from a proconsul is patent, namely C. Ummidius, C. f. Ter. Durmius Quadratus.¹⁹¹ The home town of the Ummidii is the *municipium* of Casinum, enrolled in [12] the tribe *Teretina*.¹⁹²

Spolegium was a Latin colony. That origin does not preclude the emergence of alien elements, Umbrian or Sabine, at a subsequent date in its citizen body; among the municipal aristocracy of Spolegium are found persons with a rare and revealing nomenclature, such as Vibusius, Veienus, Peducaeus, Lissidius, and Atiedius.¹⁹³ Narnia may serve as parallel (a Latin colony going back to 299 BC): it was the home of the Cocceii, and probably of Cicero's friend L. Visidius.¹⁹⁴ The latter name is doubly notable, for the termination *-idius* and for the survival of the intervocalic *s*, which in pure Latin changes to *r*.

The *gentilicium* of Calvisius is eloquent. Compare 'Carisius' or 'Mimisius', the former is certainly non-Latin, the latter may be convincingly attached to

¹⁸⁴ CIL 9.414.

¹⁸⁵ CIL 11.4772.

¹⁸⁶ CIL 11.7870 and 7883.

¹⁸⁷ CIL 10.1468.

¹⁸⁸ CIL 11.4786.

¹⁸⁹ JHS 17 (1897), 292 = IGRP 4.232.

¹⁹⁰ IGRP 3.950.

¹⁹¹ ILS 972.

¹⁹² R. Syme, 'The Ummidii', *Historia* 17 (1968) 72–105 [= RP 2.659–93].

¹⁹³ See respectively CIL 11.4818 (= ILS 6637), 4935, 4902, 4806; and 4880, 4795 (cf. 4852).

¹⁹⁴ Cocceii: *Epit. Caes.* 12.1. Visidius: cf. CIL 15.353 (L. Vesidius Receptus); see RR 83.

the Umbrian town of Asisium. The *Fasti*, providing the most flagrant advertisement of the intrusion of alien or regional elements into the governing class of Rome, suitably attest under the Triumvirate the first consul with a name ending in *-isius*.

By the social conventions of the capital, the men from the *municipia* are classified as upstarts and intruders. Even on the rich and reputable the shame of their origin bears heavily; and the disasters of the *Bellum Italicum* [13] and the civil wars depressed the fortunes of many local families. Vettius Scato, a Marsian, adopted the profession of a house-agent;¹⁹⁵ and P. Ventidius from Picenum forced his way upwards as an army contractor in the service of Caesar the proconsul.¹⁹⁶ Calvisius Sabinus may belong to a family that had maintained the dignity of its estate—he may have possessed senatorial rank before the civil wars started again. Yet he may have risen from reduced circumstances, and subaltern employment, comparable to the portentous *novus homo* P. Ventidius. Calvisius likewise may have been a ‘muleteer’.¹⁹⁷ The Revolution breaks the oligarchy, releases energy, and sets the *municipales* on the path to wealth and power.

That Calvisius Sabinus belongs to Spolegium is not just a casual item of local and antiquarian import. It fits into a large framework—the civil wars in Italy, the growth of the factions, the rise of the Caesarian oligarchy, and the creation of the New State. Evidence about the allegiance of the Latin colony of Spolegium is scanty but significant. Like other Italian *municipia*, Spolegium may be assumed to have harboured at least a nucleus of men favourable to Caesar, the political heir of C. Marius—among them perhaps many of the more influential citizens. [14] A party magnate of the calibre of Calvisius being of Spoleatine origin, Spolegium cannot have lagged behind when all Italy took the oath of allegiance to Caesar’s heir in 32 BC. The other Latin colony in the Umbrian land was Narnia, the home of the Cocceii. The Cocceii had risen to high distinction in the service of Antonius, but they did not maintain their connection to the end.

8. THE *PIETAS* OF CALVISIUS SABINUS

8.1. Political Terminology

[1] If history, as is right and proper, sets out to explain human actions as well as to record them, it must investigate the meanings of words—above all those

¹⁹⁵ Cic. *Att.* 4.5.2 and 6.1.15; cf. *Dom.* 116.

¹⁹⁶ Gell. *NA* 15.4.3; Cass. Dio 43.51.4–5.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. R. Syme, ‘Sabinus the Muleteer’, *Latomus* 17 (1958), 73–80 (= *RP* 1.393–9).

ethical terms which embody the 'ideals' (or 'values', as they are sometimes called) of a nation or a class. If they are often hollow, ambiguous, or deceptive, all the more reason for critical study. Such notions are not absolute—they are conditioned by time and place, they change from age to age, they baffle translation. What at first sight appears to be a moral concept will turn out to be largely political or social in its implications, the ideal of a class or even the label of a political party. So, and very precisely, the paramount virtues honoured by the governing class at Rome in the last epoch of the Free State. The aristocratic quality of *virtus* transcends mere *mores*: characters as diverse as Cato and Caesar were its prime exemplars.¹⁹⁸ *Libertas* comes very near to meaning 'the rule of privilege'. The men who fought and died for *Libertas* were not fanatics or theorists. Brutus and Cassius professed an ideal, sincerely: but they were defending the dignity and interests of a class.

Recent years have witnessed in Latin scholarship a salutary preoccupation with Roman moral and political terminology. Hence a whole cluster of separate studies.¹⁹⁹ Not least among them is the notion of *auctoritas*, which reveals a fundamental habit of Roman thought and life. *Pietas* too—*pietas* was the cherished and [2] typical virtue of the Roman People.

nam quantum ferro, tantum pietate potentes
stamus.²⁰⁰

Nor has *pietas* been neglected by students.²⁰¹ But *pietas* is one of the most difficult of all moral and political notions, full of traps for the unwary and easy misconceptions; and its meaning altered, very rapidly.

From the tribunate of Ti. Gracchus to the establishment of the monarchy after the War of Actium, the ancients reckoned a century of civil war. It culminated in twenty years of anarchy.²⁰² The whole century may be called revolutionary: but the term 'Revolution' may in bare fact and with full propriety be applied to the last act in the transformation of the Roman State. The rule of the Roman aristocracy was destroyed at Philippi where *Libertas* perished and *Virtus* was shattered; further, the proscriptions, a violent redistribution of property. Augustus restored, not the Republic, but names,

* [The notes of this section are drawn from a manuscript of seven pages; see the *Editorial Notes* above.]

¹⁹⁸ [1] Sall. *Cat.* 53.6: *sed memoria mea ingenti virtute, divorsis moribus fuere viri duo, M. Cato et C. Caesar.*

¹⁹⁹ Especially noteworthy are the contributions of R. Heinze, 'Auctoritas', *Hermes* 60 (1925), 348–66, and 'Fides', *ibid.*, 64 (1929), 140–66, now republished in the volume *Vom Geist des Römertums* (Leipzig and Berlin 1938), which contains an appendix (278–84) with a list of subsequent studies by other scholars.

²⁰⁰ Prop. 3.22.21–2.

²⁰¹ T. Ulrich, *Pietas (pius) als politischer Begriff im römischen Staate bis zum Tode des Kaisers Commodus* (Breslau 1930); J. Liegle, 'Pietas', *ZfN* 42 (1932), 59–100.

²⁰² Tac. *Ann.* 3.28.

forms, and conventions: the beneficiaries of the Revolution remained in possession, from M. Vipsanius Agrippa down to the freedman Isidorus.²⁰³

In twenty years of social change, habits and fashions, words and ideas changed rapidly. The results of the transformation are discovered everywhere in large matters and in small. Epicureanism and fish-ponds pass from favour. The 'new poets' of Cicero's day become quite obsolete; and diminutives drop out of poetical style. The precise stages in the process, however, cannot always be detected, largely because in the vital and determinant years of the revolutionary age, namely the rule of [3] the Triumvirs, between the Proscriptions and Actium, there is a singular and deplorable lack of contemporary evidence.

As Thucydides so pertinently remarked, in a revolution the meanings of words are turned inside out;²⁰⁴ and Cassius Dio, whose observations on this period compel attention, shows that he had read his Thucydides as a historian should.²⁰⁵ Specious phrases were adopted by politicians in their fraudulent devices, to seduce the adherents of their rivals or to deceive the neutrals. There was deliberate policy and invention. But also, and surely more important, the unconscious and spontaneous modification of words and ideas in living usage.

8.2. An Inscription from Spoletium

Pietas is one of the most remarkable catchwords of the revolutionary era. There happens to be valuable testimony of its use and meaning that has so far escaped notice. An altar with the following inscription was found near Spoletium:

Pietati / [C.] Calvisi C.f. Sabini/ patroni, cos./VIIvir. epul., cur. max./.....²⁰⁶

At once, however, a difficulty. Three men bear the name C. Calvisius Sabinus, consuls in three generations (39 BC, 4 BC, AD 26).²⁰⁷ Which of the three is here honoured for *pietas*? The earliest of them, the grandfather, is the most important. He first emerges into history as an army commander under Caesar in the Civil War, and later wins fame and honour among the marshals of Caesar's heir. But competent authorities deny him the inscription, preferring the son or the grandson.²⁰⁸ The reason is this. C. Calvisius Sabinus, cos. 39 BC, is known to have been *imperator*: the inscription does not mention that title.²⁰⁹

²⁰³ For details on the monstrous wealth of this freedman, Plin. *Nat.* 33.135. In his testament he had the effrontery to assert that his fortune had been impaired by the Civil Wars.

²⁰⁴ Thuc. 3.82.4: καὶ τὴν εἰρωσύαν ἀξίωσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐστὰ ἔργα ἀντήλλαξαν τῇ δικαιοῦσει.

²⁰⁵ Compare especially the whole section, Cass. Dio 46.34.

²⁰⁶ CIL 11.4772 = ILS 925.

²⁰⁷ PIR², C 352–4.

²⁰⁸ [2] Dessau on ILS 925; E. Groag, *RE* III, 1412; PIR² C 352.

²⁰⁹ ILS 889.

[4]²¹⁰ The objection is not quite valid. When in fact did Calvisius earn the title of *imperator*? He commanded fleets for Octavianus in the *Bellum Siculum*, with ill-fortune in 38 BC, and perhaps with negligence. In the full narrative of the *Bellum Siculum* there is recorded no incident worthy of an imperial salutation for Calvisius, even on the generous estimate of merit and the cheap honours then prevailing.²¹¹

But Calvisius later held high military command. About the time of the Battle of Actium he governed all Spain with the rank of proconsul, from which province he celebrated a triumph on May 26, 28 BC.²¹² Calvisius therefore earned his salutation in Spain.²¹³

The inscription from Spolegium could therefore, failing evidence to the contrary, be assigned to C. Calvisius Sabinus (*cos.* 39 BC). But there is no proof yet. *Pietas* will provide the clue.

[5] One looks at the inscription: one sees that Calvisius held not one priesthood but two. He was both *septemvir* and *curio maximus*. Calvisius must have been exceptionally devout in worship of the gods of Rome, zealous to maintain her cults and restore her ancient monuments. Hardly—Sabinus belongs to the company of such experts in Roman ritual as M. Vipsanius Agrippa and T. Statilius Taurus: Agrippa and Taurus, it is recorded, held several priesthoods.²¹⁴ These *novi homines* of alien and non-Latin stock, the great marshals of the revolutionary wars, knew precious little of Roman religion. They lacked both taste and leisure to acquire sacerdotal lore, or any other provinces of a Roman aristocratic education. Priesthoods, like consulates, were the spoil of civil war, the visible emblems of political success—*consulatus et sacerdotia ut spolia adepti*.²¹⁵ After Calvisius, Taurus is the next attested *curio maximus*, and none is recorded again until the great politician Eprius Marcellus.²¹⁶

Like the other marshals, Calvisius may cheerfully be denied holiness of disposition or sacerdotal predilections. That need not impair his *pietas*. The nature of that virtue is patently revealed by a stray fact preserved in the diffuse

²¹⁰ [The text of pp. 4 and 5 is derived from a different and ostensibly shorter typescript of this paper, without annotations and references to the footnotes. These have been inserted on the basis of the contents of the notes; the page numbers are printed in italics.]

²¹¹ Compare ILS 893a: [T. Sta]tilio T.f. Tauro/[a]uguri, *cos. iter., imp. Ter/[cu]rioni maximo*. Note also ILS 894: Sex. Appuleio Sex.f./imp., *cos., auguri/patron*.

²¹² App. BC 5.80–8, 96, 102; Cass. Dio 48.46.5–48.2, 54.7.

²¹³ CIL 1², p. 77. Taurus' operations are narrated by Dio under the year 29 BC (51.20.5). If Calvisius followed Taurus, his tenure will have been very short. On the other hand, Taurus was at Actium, Calvisius apparently not: Calvisius may then have been in Spain. It is here assumed that these proconsuls governed the whole of Spain, as did their predecessors in the period 39–32 BC. Cf. L. Ganter, *Die Provinzialverwaltung der Triumvirn* (Diss. Strasbourg 1892) 16–17. The subjugation of Spain was really the result of a ten years' war (29–19 BC): cf. 'The Spanish War of Augustus (26–25 B.C.)', *AJP* 55 (1934) 293–317, at 314.

²¹⁴ Vell. 2.127.1. The inscription ILS 893a attests two of Taurus' priesthoods.

²¹⁵ Tac. *Hist.* 1.2. ²¹⁶ ILS 992 [cf. *MRR* II, 424].

narrative of an Augustan historian. According to Nicolaus of Damascus, on the day of the Ides of March two men and two men only tried to protect Caesar the Dictator from the daggers of the Liberators. [6] They were C. Calvisius Sabinus and L. Marcius Censorinus.²¹⁷ *Pietas* has very little to do with religion in any modern acceptance or creed: in this context, and often elsewhere, it means dutiful loyalty towards a benefactor—or a political leader. *Pietas* is the peculiar quality of Calvisius, personified and suitably commemorated.

8.3. *Pietas* in Politics

The original and wider sense of the word denotes the recognition of duties to father and family, gods and country:²¹⁸ the revolutionary age made it narrower and more intense. A noble family was commonly the kernel of a faction. The adherents of a leader followed him not from political principle but as clients, bound to a *patronus* by the tie of *fides*, which imposed reciprocal duties. Caesar set a high standard in these matters: ‘if thugs and brigands helped him in defending his *dignitas*, he would requite them’.²¹⁹ As every party in the Civil War professes the noblest ideals of private and public virtue, patriotism above all, there is hot competition in *pietas*, which finally becomes the exclusive property of the victors. Loyalty to the party leader and loyalty to the Roman State are then blended and united. A true servant of the dynasty and the government can be described as *pietatis immobilis erga principem*;²²⁰ and treason is *impietas*, nothing less.

In the Civil Wars the party of Pompeius Magnus asserted and defended the claims of *pietas*. Not without justification. Magnus was dead, and many of the Catonians made their peace with Caesar, but the personal adherents of Pompeius fought to the end [7] and fell in battle, Afranius, Petreius, and Labienus—for Labienus, a man from Picenum, was surely no renegade but an old Pompeian.²²¹ At Munda they took *Pietas* as their watchword:²²² it was a desperate and murderous battle. A few years later Pompeius’ son Sextus advertised his devotion to his family and his party by adopting *pius* for a

²¹⁷ Nic. Dam. 26.96.

²¹⁸ Ulrich, *Pietas*, 2–11.

²¹⁹ Suet. DJ 72.2: *si grassatorum et sicariorum ope in tuenda sua dignitate usus esset, talibus quoque se parem gratiam relaturum* [‘if he had made use of the help of brigands and killers in defending his standing, he would reward even such men with equal favour’].

²²⁰ [3] Suet. Vit. 3 (on L. Vitellius, cos. III).

²²¹ Compare the arguments adduced in *JRS* 28 (1938), 113–25 [= *RP* 1.62–75]. The last member of the family, T. Labienus, the truculent orator in the time of Augustus, did not discard his *Pompeiani spiritus* (Seneca, *Controv.* 10, *praef.* 5).

²²² App. BC 2.104.

cognomen—he called himself Magnus Pompeius Pius.²²³ The Antonii too kept faith. M. Antonius professed to be *pious* towards his political allies,²²⁴ and Sextus' device was initiated by L. Antonius in 41 BC who, to proclaim his loyalty to his brother, added *pietas* to his name, L. Antonius Pietas.²²⁵

Octavianus steadily won for himself the catchwords as well as the adherents of rival parties, finally acquiring a monopoly. In the year 27 BC the Roman Senate, duly grateful for a restored Republic, voted that a shield be inscribed and hung up, exhibiting the four cardinal virtues of Augustus, as he was now called.²²⁶ The four virtues have provoked a considerable literature, which cannot be here discussed. One of them was *pietas*. What does it mean in this context? Perhaps in general Augustus' selfless and patriotic devotion to the good of the Roman Commonwealth.²²⁷ Yet the meaning may be more traditional, namely obedience towards the gods, a virtue advertised by the Romans when first they spoke for themselves to the Hellenic world and noticed especially by foreign observers.²²⁸

However that may be, Augustus had conspicuously displayed *pietas* in a narrower sense. Did not Heaven itself command that a son should avenge his father? Now Sex. Pompeius was not the only Roman with a parent to avenge, a party loyalty to sustain.

[8] On Caesar's heir was imposed a sacred and personal obligation, which he bore with pertinacity and with success. *Singulari pietate adulescens*:²²⁹ it was his sacred duty to exact penalty from the murderers of his father. For political reasons, it is true, he was ready to waive the blood-feud, exploiting an armed alliance with Republicans in order to extort recognition from Antonius.²³⁰ But not for long. *Pietas* was soon satisfied.

Augustus in the *Res Gestae* sets forth the beginnings of his career—he raised a private army to rescue the commonwealth from the domination of a faction

²²³ BMCRR 2.370 [= RRC 511]; ILS 8891. Compare Ulrich, *o.c.* 12. Nearly sixty years before Q. Metellus Pius (*cos.* 80) had taken that *cognomen* in order to celebrate his exertions for an exiled father.

²²⁴ Cic. *Phil.* 13.42 (quoting in derision a despatch of Antonius): *omitto alia; 'fidem Dolabellae', sanctissimi viri, deserere homo pius non potest.* Likewise towards Lepidus: *nec Lepidi societatem violare, piissimi hominis (ibid.).*

²²⁵ Cass. Dio 48.5.4: διὰ γὰρ τὴν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν εὐσέβειαν καὶ ἐπωνυμίαν αὐτῷ Πιέταν ἐπέθετο. Compare his coins with the legend *Pietas Cos.* on the reverse (BMC, *R.Rep.* II, 400).

²²⁶ RG 34.

²²⁷ Ulrich, *o.c.*, 17: 'der erhöhte Pflichtgefühl des Kaisers gegenüber dem römischen Staate im seiner historischen Gebundenheit, des Kaisers Anknüpfen an und Rücksichtnehmen auf die in den Gefühlen der Römer, besonders in ihren oberen Schichten, tief verwurzelte altrömisch-republikanische Tradition'.

²²⁸ [4] So J. Liegle, 'Pietas', *ZfN* 42 (1932), 59–100, invoking Polybius 6.56.6–11 and the letter of M. Valerius to Teos in 193 BC: καὶ ὅτι | μὲν διόλου πλείστον λόγον ποιούμενοι διατελοῦ- | μεν τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβείας, μάλιστ' ἂν τις στο-|χάζοιτο ἐκ τῆς συναντωμένης ἡμῖν εὐμενείας | διὰ ταῦτα παρὰ τοῦ δαιμονίου (*SIG*³ 601, 12–15 [‘That we wholly and constantly have attached the greatest importance to reverence of the gods one can estimate from the goodwill we have experienced on this account from the supreme deity’, trans. R. K. Sherk]).

²²⁹ Cic. *Phil.* 13.46.

²³⁰ Cic. *Phil.* 5.50: *omnis Caesar inimicitias rei publicae condonavit* [‘Caesar set aside his personal enmities for the sake of the commonwealth’].

and he took vengeance on the assassins of his father, defeating them in battle.²³¹ His recourse to civil war, *impia arma*, is thus explained and excused on two counts, a state of public emergency and the claim of *pietas*. Augustus does not use the word himself in this passage. But it stands out in the parallel and contrasted accounts which Tacitus gives of the life and actions of the *Princeps*—a summary, as it were, of the *Res Gestae* and a malignant parody of that document.²³² In both the phrase is *pietas erga parentem*, whether admitted as a just plea or derided as mere pretence.

In the first years after Actium, the victorious leader laid heavy emphasis upon his rank as Caesar's son, heir, and avenger, his Trojan lineage, his military glory.²³³ Then full honour is paid to Romulus, whom Livy describes as *deum deo natum, regem parentemque urbis Romae*.²³⁴ Caesar's heir might even have taken the name for himself:²³⁵ he is still *dux* rather than *princeps*. In time, the Caesarian colouring fades, but gradually—there is no abrupt change when the 'Republic' is restored in the years 28 and 27 BC. In due process, Augustus [9] becomes *princeps*, less a Caesarian and more a Pompeian, if that ambiguous and deceptive term should be permitted.

About the earlier Augustus in the decade after Actium one of the best documents in the epic poem which Virgil was composing in the years when Augustus was *pulchra Troianus origine Caesar*.²³⁶ The *Aeneid* is not merely a national epic—it is personal and partisan, not only coloured, but drenched with recent history. The mission of Aeneas is the mission of Caesar's heir, projected into the past—*Romanam condere gentem*.²³⁷ No contemporary could have been blind to the allegory. The stock epithet of the hero is *pius*; and Augustus is

Troius Aeneas pietate insignis et armis.²³⁸

Now the *pietas* of Augustus is all-embracing: it is selfless devotion to his mission of founding Rome anew. None the less, his loyalty to Caesar and insistence on vengeance is also *pietas*. It may be transcended in a larger loyalty to Rome, but it is not forgotten.

Calvisius' *pietas* was the sense of duty towards a patron, benefactor, and leader. It deserves to be signalled out as valuable testimony for the history of Roman political terminology in the revolutionary era. Calvisius himself is a

²³¹ RG 1–2. ²³² Tac. *Ann.* 1.9 and 10.

²³³ On this period, cf. especially A. von Premerstein, 'Von Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats', *Abh. Bay. Ak. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.* n. F. 15 (1937), 8–12; E. Kornemann, 'Zum Augustusjahr', *Klio* 31 (1938), 81–91.

²³⁴ Livy 1.16.3.

²³⁵ Dio (53.16.7) actually says that he would have preferred it. On the significance of Romulus at this time, compare K. Scott, 'The Identification of Augustus with Romulus', *TAPA* 56 (1925), 82–105; J. Gagé, 'Romulus-Augustus', *MEFR* 47 (1930), 138–81.

²³⁶ *Aen.* 1.286.

²³⁷ *Aen.* 1.33.

²³⁸ *Aen.* 6.403.

character that invited study. In modern times he had been unduly neglected: in antiquity he was overshadowed by the other marshals of Octavianus, though he was senior in rank and experience both to Agrippa and to Taurus—and probably the patron of Taurus, who is first mentioned in his company and who inherits his office of *curio maximus*.²³⁹ Calvisius and Taurus unite and blend to form an unholy monster, a Minotaurus,²⁴⁰ so Cicero affirms. [10] Calvisius' ill-success as an admiral in the *Bellum Siculum* may have set him back.²⁴¹

8.4. The Origin of Calvisius Sabinus

History first has record of the Caesarian partisan Calvisius in 48 BC, when he commanded in Aetolia a detachment of troops, five legionary cohorts, and some cavalry.²⁴² There is no evidence that he was a senator before the outbreak of the Civil War. Perhaps he was still only of equestrian rank: for such a command to be held by a knight was a little anomalous but in no way outrageous. Yet he might have been a quaestor by now, for Caesar had provided for elections in December, 49 BC. Compare L. Staius Murcus (*pr.* 45), likewise active in 48 BC: Staius is described as a *legatus*.²⁴³ Further, P. Ventidius (*pr.* 43) was certainly among the earliest of Caesar's equestrian adherents to enter the Senate.²⁴⁴ Calvisius himself was probably praetor in 46—he governed Africa in 45.²⁴⁵ Calvisius, it may be presumed, owed to Caesar not only advancement in his career but also his *dignitas*, his rank as a senator. Caesar was very precisely the *patronus* of Calvisius, with a right to claim his loyal devotion, *fides* and *pietas*.

It remains to investigate the origin and antecedents of Calvisius. If nothing else, his type and class among the Caesarians can surely be established. The dominant figure of Caesar has engrossed the attention of history, of literature

²³⁹ MRR II, 424.

²⁴⁰ Cic. *Fam.* 12.25.1 (late in March, 43 BC): *magna senatus approbatio consecuta est cum summo gaudio et offensione Minotauri, id est Calvisi et Tauri*. Taurus was probably a legate of Calvisius. The inscription ILS 893a records Taurus as *curio maximus*. [5] (It would be unnecessary, and perhaps fanciful, to speculate further about the term 'Minotaurus'. Yet it was peculiarly appropriate in this context. To a Roman, the word Sabinus connoted implacable severity; and Minos was the grim judge of the dead. Hence Sabinus + Taurus = Minotaurus.)

²⁴¹ [The latter sentence has been crossed out with a slight pencil stroke.]

²⁴² Caes. BC 3.34.2.

²⁴³ Caes. BC 3.15–16.

²⁴⁴ Gell. NA 15.4.3: *non modo in amicitiam Caesaris, sed ex ea in amplissimum quoque ordinem pervenisse; mox tribunum quoque plebe ac deinde praetorem creatum* ['he did not just attain the friendship of Caesar, but through that the most prestigious order; he was shortly afterwards elected to the tribunate of the plebs, and later to the praetorship'].

²⁴⁵ Cic. *Phil.* 3.26; cf. W. Sternkopf, 'Die Verteilung der römischen Provinzen vor dem mutinensischen Kriege', *Hermes* 47 (1912), 388.

and of legend, to the almost complete eclipse of his allies and partisans. Now Caesar was a great party leader, following and surpassing [11] Pompeius in the line of the *στασίαρχοι μοναρχικοί*.²⁴⁶

If one turns aside from the history, or rather the biography, of Caesar, to examine the composition of his party, valuable facts at once emerge.²⁴⁷ Caesar had been a *popularis*—but so had Pompeius. Nor can one unequivocally speak of a party of the *populares*. But *Optimates* there were, the dominant faction under Cato's leadership in the oligarchy of government after Sulla. When Caesar the proconsul won glory in Gaul and command of patronage, all the enemies of the oligarchy and of Pompeius Magnus saw a chance at last to regain status, wealth, and power, with or without a civil war.

As would be expected, Caesar's following was neither homogeneous nor wholly revolutionary: it included men of patrician family and comfortable bankers. Two elements in it, however, deserve special attention, the survivors of defeated causes. First the *Italici*, the peoples of the central highlands from Picenum down to Samnium and Lucania who had risen against Rome only forty years before: certain members of the local aristocratic houses of *Italia* are conspicuous among the adherents of Caesar. Secondly, the faction of Marius, which was especially strong in Etruria, Umbria, and Campania.

Caesar requited his municipal and Italian partisans by promotion to senatorial rank. *tota Italia*, the ideal of Cicero and the final achievement of Augustus after a national war and national revival, owes much more to Caesar the Dictator than has commonly been allowed.²⁴⁸ Caesar began a revolution but sought to stem its advance. His heirs, from sheer necessity, were more radical. Caesar gave [12] the consulate to no man whose name, by root or termination, betrays origin from a non-Latin stock. But the first pair of consuls appointed by the Caesarian leaders Antonius, Octavianus, and Lepidus when they formed a coalition in the autumn in 43 BC, re-uniting the Caesarian party, were a political manifesto by reason of their nomenclature alone. One of them was C. Carrinas, of a Marian family, Etruscan or Umbrian in origin.²⁴⁹ The other was P. Ventidius, from Picenum.

Ventidius in infancy had been captured at Asculum and conducted in the triumph of Pompeius Strabo.²⁵⁰ L. Staius Murcus, another of Caesar's new senators, clearly derives from the central highlands, as the *gentilicium*

²⁴⁶ As Appian terms them (BC 1.2: ['faction leaders who aspired to monarchy']).

²⁴⁷ Compare the remarks in R. Syme, 'Caesar, the Senate, and Italy', *PBSR* 14 (1938), 1–31, esp. 12–18 [= *RP* 1.88–119, at 99–105].

²⁴⁸ *PBSR* 14 (1938), 8, 30–1 [= *RP* 1.95–6, 118–19].

²⁴⁹ He is presumably the son of the Marian general C. Carrinas. On the name, W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin 1904) 530.

²⁵⁰ The essential evidence about Ventidius is supplied by Gell. *NA* 15.4; Plin. *Nat.* 7.135; Cass. Dio 43.51.4–5.

indicates—perhaps Marsian.²⁵¹ One will also note C. Asinius Pollio (*tr. pl.* 47, *pr.* 45, *cos.* 40) whose grandfather had led the Marrucini to battle;²⁵² and Poppaedi Silo, a friend of Ventidius.²⁵³ Poppaedi is surely a Marsian, a member of the family that provided one of the two consuls of the confederate state of the *Italici* in 90 BC.

Now the gentile name 'Calvisius' exhibits a palpably non-Latin termination. No study has been made of the local distribution of names ending in *-isius* (or, for that matter, *-asius*).²⁵⁴ Which is much to be regretted. They are rare and noteworthy. Roughly contemporary is P. Carisius, legate of Augustus in Spain in 26–22 BC, the founder of the colony of Emerita Augusta.²⁵⁵ The only other person of any consequence in this period possessing such a name is the Augustan senator, Post. Mimiis Sardus;²⁵⁶ he belongs to a family of municipal magistrates in Asisium, a city of Umbria.²⁵⁷

[13] C. Calvisius Sabinus may have come from Spoletium, of which city he was patron;²⁵⁸ or perhaps from Sabine territory to the east and south-east. The *cognomen* 'Sabinus' might help here. Note, for example, the Augustan *novus homo* and military man C. Poppaeus Sabinus: his town was Interamna Praetuttiorum, geographically in Picenum but ethnically Sabine.²⁵⁹

But the *cognomen* 'Sabinus' is very common; and for Calvisius there are indications that point much further south-eastwards. In the first place, one of the Calvisii Sabini, it is uncertain which, was *patronus* of the town of Canusium.²⁶⁰ Secondly, T. Statilius Taurus first turns up in history in the company of Calvisius Sabinus;²⁶¹ he may have been his legate in Africa in 45 BC. Now Taurus was probably Lucanian in origin. There was a Statilius who led the levies of the Lucanians at the time of the Second Punic War;²⁶² and a dedication to Taurus was discovered at Volceii, in Lucania.²⁶³ It looks as though Calvisius was the benefactor and patron of Taurus; and Taurus held the sacerdotal office of *curio maximus*,²⁶⁴ which had belonged to Calvisius. The two parts of the Minotaurus may well have come from the same region.

²⁵¹ On Staius, cf. F. Münzer, *RE* IIIA, no. 2, 2136–9. The inscription *ILS* 885 was found at Introdacqua, near Sulmo. But it is by no means certain that he was a Paelignian: according to *ILS* 932, the first Paelignian senator was Q. Varius Geminus, in the time of Augustus.

²⁵² [6] *Livy Per.* 73.

²⁵³ Cass. Dio 48.41.1. He was a legate and quaestor to Ventidius in the war against the Parthians. For the true form of the name (not 'Poppaedi'), cf. W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, 367.

²⁵⁴ Observe, for example, the brothers Caepasii, *ignoti homines et repentini* (Cic. *Brut.* 242). The first consul with a name of this type is Sex. Vitulastus Nepos, suffect in AD 78. He probably came from the land of the Vestini, cf. *ILS* 9368 (near Peltuinum) and *CIL* 9.3587 (Vestine territory).

²⁵⁵ Cass. Dio 53.26.1; *BMCRE* 1.55–6.

²⁵⁶ *ILS* 947.

²⁵⁷ *ILS* 5346.

²⁵⁸ *ILS* 925.

²⁵⁹ As may be inferred from *ILS* 5671; 6526.

²⁶⁰ *CIL* 9.414.

²⁶¹ Cic. *Fam.* 12.25.1.

²⁶² *Livy* 22.42.4–[6].

²⁶³ *ILS* 893a.

²⁶⁴ *ILS* 893a, cf. *ILS* 925.

Thirdly, a dubious point, for it touches the pedigree of the Antonine Emperors. You cannot be too sceptical about the genealogical claims of the old colonial families. For example, it was even alleged that the line of Marcus Aurelius derived from the Sabine King of Rome, Numa Pompilius.²⁶⁵ That is just silly. Another assertion is more instructive. P. Calvisius Tullus (*cos.* AD 109) was the grandfather of the Emperor M. Aurelius: his lineage was referred back to a Messapian royal line, to a certain [14] Malemnus, son of Dasumius, founder of the town of Lupiae in Calabria.²⁶⁶ If the name 'Calvisius' was known to derive from south-eastern Italy, the genealogical claim of these Antonine Calvisii would have been plausible support. It does not, of course, follow, that the *stemma* was authentic, that the ancestors of M. Aurelius were in fact Messapian or Lucanian. They may well have been Spanish, like the Annii (from Uccubi). C. Calvisius Sabinus (*cos.* 39 BC) was proconsul of Spain: there is clear evidence that he spread the *gentilicium* Calvisius by grant of the citizenship to native Spaniards.²⁶⁷

The consular *Fasti* provide the most flagrant advertisement of the intrusion of alien elements into the governing class of Rome, Republican or Imperial.²⁶⁸ The years of the Triumvirate show their revolutionary character beyond dispute. Not only the alien from Punic Gades, L. Cornelius Balbus, suffect consul in 40 BC. Nomenclature reveals the triumph of the non-Latin stocks of Italy, with the pair Carrinas and Ventidius, with P. Alfenus Varus (*cos. suff.* 39). Further, C. Calvisius Sabinus is the first consul with a name ending in *-isius*. A similar type, that in *-asius*, has to wait a long time yet for recognition.²⁶⁹

8.5. The Consuls of 39 BC and the Career of Calvisius Sabinus

In the autumn of the year 40, Antonius and Octavianus averted civil war and once again consolidated the Caesarian party, by the Pact of Brundisium.²⁷⁰ Shortly after, a mysterious incident. Q. Salvidienus Rufus, governing all Gaul for Octavianus, was accused of treason and declared a public enemy:

²⁶⁵ SHA, *M. Ant. Phil.* 1.6: *cuius familia in originem recurrens a Numa probatur sanguine trahere, ut Marius Maximus docet* ['His family, in tracing its origin back to the beginning, claimed descent from Numa, as Marius Maximus tells']. This appears to be accepted by W. Weber, *Rom: Herrschertum und Reich* (Stuttgart and Berlin 1937) 284.

²⁶⁶ [7] SHA, *M. Ant. Phil.* 1.6. Compare E. Groag, 'Zu neuen Inschriften', *JOAI* 29 (1935), Beiblatt 180.

²⁶⁷ Note the person at Clunia, C. Calvisius Aionis f. Galeria Sabinus, who was *flamen Romae et divi Augusti* (CIL 2.2782; 2822, quoted in *PIR*², C 352).

²⁶⁸ Compare Münzer, *RA*, 47–8.

²⁶⁹ Sex. Vitulasisus Nepos, *cos. suff.* AD 78.

²⁷⁰ [The title of this section is an editorial addition. The text that follows has been drawn from two different, if closely similar typescripts: in one text it goes under the title of 'The Career of Calvisius Sabinus', while in the annotated version that has been followed so far it has the title 'The Consuls of 39 BC'.]

Antonius revealed²⁷¹ [14] the fact that Salvidienus had been ready to abandon Octavianus. The whole matter is quite obscure. Sufficient that he was put to death. Salvidienus, present along with Agrippa in the camp at Apollonia was one [15] of the earliest personal adherents of Octavianus, one of the foundation members of his party; and victory in the War of Perugia was largely due to his services. According to Suetonius, Augustus dropped only two of his friends, and that for the gravest of reasons, treachery.²⁷² They were Salvidienus and Gallus. About neither can be truth ever be discovered. As for Gallus, when the Senate passed a condemnatory decree, Augustus commended it for *pietas*.²⁷³ The offence of Salvidienus will also have been represented as a breach of political loyalty, as a sin against *pietas*.

Now Salvidienus, though not yet a senator in rank, had been designated consul for 39 BC. The traitor was suppressed. It is significant that the *Fasti* of that year open with the names of Calvisius and Censorinus, two loyal Caesarians who had sought to protect Caesar the Dictator. Caesar's heir advertised the rewards of *pietas*.

There is no evidence at all to show how long in advance the consuls for 39 BC had been designated, or which of them occupied the place intended for Salvidienus. Octavianus' friend, the victor of the *Bellum Perusinum*, would surely have been *consul ordinarius*—presumably with the Antonian L. Marcus Censorinus, ex-governor of Macedonia, for colleague. If so, Calvisius was the gainer.

[Until his] [16] consulate, or rather down to his command in the *Bellum Siculum*, his activities are veiled in utter darkness. After the assassination of the Dictator, Calvisius was, if anything, an Antonian. At least Antonius, when allotting provinces on November 28, 44 BC, gave him *Africa vetus*, which he had already governed the year before.²⁷⁴ On December 20, however, the Senate refused to recognise the grant, supporting the proconsul Q. Cornificius;²⁷⁵ and it finally passed a *senatus consultum* on the matter in March, to which Calvisius showed compliance.²⁷⁶ It appears that he had not in fact left Italy to take possession of the province. After these transactions, a regrettable gap in the history of Calvisius, until his consulate discloses his allegiance. The task of tracing the growth of the faction of Octavianus from its undistinguished beginnings is very arduous. The earliest adherents were of equestrian rank, of municipal extraction—Salvidienus, Maecenas, and Vipsanius, a fine trio of *gentilicia*. It is not likely that Calvisius had made his choice as early as the winter of 44/43 BC. He was biding his time. Hence no point in invoking the fact

²⁷¹ [The annotated typescript breaks off here; p. 15 is missing. The gap between p. 14 and p. 16 has been supplemented from the other surviving typescript of 'The *Pietas* of Calvisius Sabinus'. The following footnotes, with the exception of nos. 273–7, have been added by the Editor. The page numbers of the other typescript are printed in italics.]

²⁷² Suet. *Aug.* 66.2.

²⁷³ Suet. *Aug.* 66.4.

²⁷⁴ Cic. *Phil.* 3.26.

²⁷⁵ Cic. *Phil.* 3.26; *Fam.* 12.22.3.

²⁷⁶ *Fam.* 12.25.1–2.

that, precisely at Spoletium, the young Caesar assumed his first *imperium* on the day of January 7, 43 BC.²⁷⁷ Still, Calvisius soon ceased being an Antonian—at least his name, by its form and sound easily to be derided, does not occur in those full lists of discreditable Antonian partisans retailed with such relish by Cicero in the later *Philippics*.²⁷⁸

* * *

[10]²⁷⁹ Calvisius could have acquired senatorial rank through a magistracy in 48 or 47 BC—compare Q. Cornificius quaestor in 48, C. Asinius Pollio tribune of the plebs in 47, both praetors in 45.²⁸⁰ That Calvisius was praetor in 46 is only deduced from his governorship of *Africa vetus* in the next year.²⁸¹ [11] There is a chance that Calvisius Sabinus may be the Sabinus referred to as a friend of C. Trebonius in a letter belonging to the year 46 BC.²⁸² Cicero plays on the name Sabinus, alludes to the man's speech and bearing as worthy of his *cognomen*—and, with deliberate frivolity, throws out the suggestion that the prepossessing *cognomen* may deliberately have been adopted, after the fashion of candidates for office. Nor will one omit to recall in this context the muleteer Sabinus, commemorated by the tenth poem of the Virgilian *Catalepton*. The upstart there caricatured might be not P. Ventidius, but precisely Calvisius Sabinus.

A name so common as 'Sabinus' cannot safely support conjecture. To return to the facts about Calvisius. He had left his province and was already back in Rome by the day of the Ides of March, 44 BC—destined perhaps along with other military men to accompany the Dictator to Macedonia. Calvisius had left *legati* behind him in the province, at Utica, and still maintained that he was the governor, on what plea and justification it cannot be guessed, even when, in the course of the year (the date is not recorded) the Senate allocated *Africa vetus* to Q. Cornificius.²⁸³ The claim of Calvisius was recognised by M. Antonius at the distribution of provinces hastily carried through on

²⁷⁷ Cic. *Phil.* 3.26.

²⁷⁸ For example, *Phil.* 11.10–15; 12.2–3 and 13.26–9. In the spring of this year he wrote of Calvisius as *homo magni iudicii* (*Fam.* 10.26.3)—not that anything could be made of that. [At this point in the annotated typescript there is the following handwritten annotation: 'So far the historical Calvisius Sabinus. By way of an appendix it may be not be inappropriate to devote a few words to a Sabinus who is a literary problem. Here too the revolutionary upstarts come in for discussion.' The 'appendix' to the study on Calvisius Sabinus that is alluded to here is a paper that was later published as free-standing piece: 'Sabinus the Muleteer', *Latomus* 17 (1958), 73–80 (= *RP* 1, 393–9); lightly reworked versions of two notes with which this manuscript ends may also be found in that paper.]

²⁷⁹ [The following section has been derived from the unannotated typescript of 'The *Pietas*', and provides further discussion of Calvisius' political background that is missing in the annotated version.]

²⁸⁰ *MRR* II, 203, 276–7, 287, 306.

²⁸¹ *MRR* II, 295.

²⁸² Cic. *Fam.* 15.20.1.

²⁸³ Cic. *Phil.* 3.26.

the [12] evening of 28 November, but Calvisius did not go out there; and Cornificius remained in possession, strengthened by the Senate's decree of 20 December, enjoining upon all governors to continue as they were.²⁸⁴ The matter was not finally cleared up until, in response to despatches from Cornificius, the Senate passed a firm decree on March 19, 43 BC.²⁸⁵ Voices had even been raised, to have the conduct of Calvisius and his associate Statilius Taurus officially stigmatised, but the consul Pansa, as usual, deprecated any form of extreme action. Calvisius acquiesced.²⁸⁶ No wonder—the political balance had turned sharply against Antonius and his friends, and the war was now in progress in the North, moving fast towards a decision near Mutina.

Calvisius continued in the paths of discretion. In the summer he was cultivating Cicero. The political situation had become delicate and intricate—Octavianus in the Cisalpina with his own force and the legions of the dead consuls, Antonius retreating into Gaul, and in the western provinces three generals with a Caesarian past, ambiguous in their allegiance to the cause of the Republic, Lepidus, Plancus, and Pollio. Cicero was making desperate attempts to strengthen the loyalty of Plancus. In two of his letters to C. Furnius, one of the legates of Plancus, Calvisius is mentioned.²⁸⁷ He [13] is described as a friend of Furnius. Furnius, tribune of the plebs in 50 BC, was apparently a Caesarian in 49 BC.²⁸⁸ There is no record of his activities since that date. Nothing is known of his origin, but he was a person of some oratorical accomplishment—and no doubt of diplomatic talent. Like the subtle Munatius Plancus, he survived the Civil Wars. It is unfortunate that the evidence does not reveal any link between Calvisius and Plancus.

Present in the company of Cicero and Calvisius when one of the letters was dispatched to Furnius was a man called Caecina. This is probably the agent of Octavianus, *Caecina quidam Volaterranus*, whom the young adventurer had employed in the previous November when attempting to gain Cicero's support for the march on Rome.²⁸⁹

Calvisius is thus revealed at or near the centre of diplomatic negotiations. Cicero commends him for sound judgement—*homo magni iudicii*.²⁹⁰ Even were there a hint of irony in the compliment, it was none the less a proper tribute, not to be belied by subsequent events. Calvisius did not emerge again, if at all, as a partisan and beneficiary of Antonius until it was quite safe. His name, by its very form and sound so easily to be derided, does not occur in those full lists of discreditable Antonian partisans retailed [14] with such relish by the orator in the later *Philippics*.

It might have seemed both desirable and impossible to escape notice in those eventful and dangerous years. Yet nothing is heard of the senior consular

²⁸⁴ Cic. *Phil.* 3.37–9, 5.2–5, 28.

²⁸⁵ Cic. *Fam.* 12.25.1–2.

²⁸⁶ Cic. *Fam.* 12.25.1.

²⁸⁷ Cic. *Fam.* 10.25.5 and 26.3.

²⁸⁸ *MRR* II, 249.

²⁸⁹ Cic. *Att.* 16.8.2.

²⁹⁰ Cic. *Fam.* 10.26.3.

Cn. Domitius Calvinus between the morning of the Ides of March and the campaign of Philippi—whether the man's caution gives the reason or gaps in the historical record. As for Calvisius Sabinus, neither Philippi reveals his name nor the intrigues, the marches and the sieges of the Perusine War. Spoletium, his city, was used as a basis by the Antonian Munatius Plancus during the Perusine affair. Absent from the tale of the wars, the military man simply turns up as *consul ordinarius* for the year 39 BC.

* * *

[16] Nor can the date be established at which Calvisius joined the party of Caesar's heir. From the spring of 43 BC down to his consulate, as has been shown, Calvisius is lost to knowledge. The year 38 BC certifies his allegiance—Agrippa absent in Gaul and Calvinus in Spain, Calvisius is the admiral in charge of operations against Sex. Pompeius. The results were disastrous, and Octavianus appointed Agrippa as high admiral in the next year.

The growth of the Caesarian party is a theme of enormous importance and baffling intricacy. Information is tendentious as well as incomplete, for many men had a past needing to be covered or embellished, with a disposition to antedate their adhesion to the 'better cause'. There is a certain ambiguity in the career of the most brilliant of the patrician Valerii, the young Messalla Corvinus. An ex-Republican ally of Antonius, he gradually slid over to Octavianus. Messalla is first attested serving under Octavianus in the maritime operations of 36 BC.²⁹¹ He may have turned already; yet he may not yet have declared himself openly—for Octavianus and Antonius were still allies.

In the case of the *novus homo* T. Statilius Taurus, the difficulty proceeds from lack of any evidence, honest or tainted. He emerges as suffect consul in 37 BC, [17] without record of service to anybody, to explain his elevation.²⁹² There are no grounds for claiming him as an Antonian: a better surmise would be merit won under Octavianus' marshals in Gaul and Spain, or unrecorded efforts with Calvisius on the seas. In 36 BC Taurus commanded one of Octavianus' fleets in the invasion of Sicily, starting from Tarentum.²⁹³ Taurus had under him the ships lent by Antonius. This fact has been taken to prove that Taurus was a partisan of Antonius, which is far from evident, and *novus homo* had not the political freedom of action enjoyed by a *nobilis*. It will be preferable to believe that Statilius Taurus was carried forward by Calvisius Sabinus, with whom the first and solitary notice about his earlier career associates him.

Calvisius was soon outstripped by his old friend and left far behind in the final count of fame: rising to be next in power to Marcus Agrippa, Taurus actually achieved a second consulate in 26 BC, as a suitable inauguration of the

²⁹¹ App. BC 5.102. See RE VIII A, 1, 140–1, no. 261.

²⁹² MRR II, 396.

²⁹³ App. BC 5.97.

restored Republic. From this first consulate, Taurus had gone steadily forward, while Calvisius fell back, hampered by his ill success as an admiral. Others took the toil, the perils, and the glory in the invasion and conquest of Sicily: Calvisius had to be content with a commission to put down brigandage and clean up the Italian [18] countryside, which task he executed in the course of a year.²⁹⁴ Statilius Taurus governed Africa after the deposition of Lepidus, passed on after his triumph to Illyricum there to consolidate the successes of Octavianus, and commanded the land army at the Battle of Actium.²⁹⁵ All that Calvisius was able to do in the meantime was to attack Antonius—in words, in the Roman Senate. He produced shocking revelations. One of the enormities of Antonius was a slight upon C. Furnius, ‘the most eloquent of the Romans’—he left a court of law while Furnius was speaking, because the Queen of Egypt happened to be passing by.²⁹⁶

The record of the campaign of Actium does not include Calvisius Sabinus among the generals on land or sea. It may be conjectured that he was holding Spain for his leader, as governor of the whole peninsula. No historian mentions his name: Dio has only a brief note about the operations of Statilius Taurus, presumably his successor.²⁹⁷ However, for one reason or for another, Calvisius celebrated a triumph from Spain on May 26, 28 BC. The Spanish campaigns of the years 26 and 25 BC, conducted by Augustus or under his supervision, have naturally engrossed the monopoly of fame and historical record. It is clear that adequate preparation had been made in advance, by other generals, and with [19] less advertisement. With the proceeds of the war booty Calvisius repaired the Via Latina, and that is the last service of C. Calvisius Sabinus to Caesar’s heir and to the Roman People.²⁹⁸ A twenty years’ career from his début has little to show in the way of military excellence. Nor was Calvisius one of the great diplomats of the period. Steadfast loyalty commended him—and perhaps the possession of strong local influence in some town or region of Italy. Spolegium revealed the dedication to the *pietas* of C. Calvisius Sabinus, and Spolegium is certainly his town.

8.6. The End of the Calvisii

The new families rising with the monarchy exhibit in all ways the vicissitudes of fortune and duration. Some lapse at once, others persists, and intermarry with the old aristocracy and even with the dynasty of the Julii and Claudii. Powerfully inaugurated by a *vir triumphalis*, the nobility of the Calvisii Sabini

²⁹⁴ App. BC 5.132. ²⁹⁵ RE III A, 2, 2200–1, no. 34.

²⁹⁶ Plut. Ant. 58.5–6: δεινότατος εἰπεῖν Ῥωμαίων.

²⁹⁸ CIL 10.6895, 6897, 6899–901, AE 1969/1970, 89.

²⁹⁷ Cass. Dio 51.20.5.

is maintained by the son and the grandson, for two generations only in the direct line.

The great Calvisius himself fades from record after his triumph and his repair of the Via Latina. Which is [20] not surprising. Very little is heard of any of the Triumviral marshals in the years of peace and ordered government. Few of them were wanted any more, and some might be a nuisance. But the silence thickens—nothing at all stands on record about the son, save the fact of his consulate in 4 BC. Marriage is a potent factor in social ascent and in dynastic politics. As the matrimonial alliances of those Calvisii have not come to light, all conjecture is frustrated concerning their political activities, open or secret, under the rule of Augustus. The first fact to emerge is the marriage of Calvisia Flaccilla to a Claudius Marcellus.²⁹⁹ The identity of the husband can be established with a fair measure of probability. Not one of the three related consuls in the last three years of the Republic, 51, 50, and 49 BC. Nor again, it would seem, Aeserninus, the elderly consul of 22 BC, and certainly not his son (whose existence is only certified by the deduction that he must have married a daughter of Asinius Pollio). There remains the last of the Marcelli, Pollio's grandson and an eminent orator himself, M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus (*pr.* AD 19). A *nobilis* of such lineage had a sure claim to the consulate, and a notice in Tacitus seems to imply that the orator was consul—*meminissent Asinii, Messalae ac recentiores Arruntii [21] et Aeserninii: ad summa provectos incorrupta vita et facundia*.³⁰⁰ It is conceivable that Aeserninus was consul suffect in the year AD 22. If so, if he lived as long or longer, it is strange that a person of his distinction leaves no mark in the senatorial debates and senatorial trials so frequently and so fully narrated by the historian Tacitus. His sole act recorded, and his last, is a refusal to defend Cn. Piso in AD 20. However, that may be, he concerns the history of the Calvisii in this, that his wife is Calvisia Flaccilla, probably a daughter of C. Calvisius Sabinus, *cos.* 4 BC.³⁰¹

And now for the last of the Calvisii. This is C. Calvisius Sabinus, *consul ordinarius* in AD 26 with Lentulus Gaetulicus for colleague. He escaped one charge of *maiestas* in AD 32, but, accused again under Caligula in AD 39, shortly after his return from the governorship of Pannonia, he chose to commit suicide.³⁰² His wife, who shared his fate, was called Cornelia. The attractive conjecture has been made that she was of the patrician house of the Lentuli, a sister of Lentulus Gaetulicus. That eminent patronage, the legate of Germania Superior, was suppressed before many months elapsed on a charge of conspiracy against the Emperor. Gaetulicus had held his [22] post for ten years.

²⁹⁹ CIA 3.868.

³⁰⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 11.6.3 ['they should remember Asinius, Messala, and more recently Arruntius and Aeserninus: they had been raised to the heights without corrupting their life and eloquence'].
³⁰¹ Cf. *RE* III, 1, 1413, no. 20.

³⁰² Cass. Dio 49.18.4.

Calvisius may well have been appointed by Tiberius to Pannonia, sharing the great confidence that prince reposed in the Lentuli, and involved in their subsequent ruin. The catastrophe also carried off the last of the Aemilii Lepidi.

The direct line of the Calvisii Sabini, carried by the three homonymous *consules ordinarii* (39 BC, 4 BC, AD 26) now lapses, but the name at least seems to be perpetuated for one generation more presumably through an adoption. P. Pomponius Secundus, suffect consul in AD 44, and legate of Germania Superior in AD 50, was one of the leading literary figures of the Claudio-Neronian age, a dramatic poet of superior achievement. One inscription set up at Vindonissa during his command shows that *Pomponius Secundus* was not the whole of his name; and the other fragments combined reveal [*Calv*]isio Sabino [*Pomponio Sec*]undo.³⁰³ It is generally stated in authoritative works that the name of the legate is P. Calvisius Sabinus Pomponius Secundus.³⁰⁴ Two observations are called for. First, the praenomen *P(ublius)* does not actually occur on any of the Vindonissa fragments—it is supplied from other documents attesting the consulate of P. Pomponius Secundus. Secondly, [*Num*]isio Sabino might appear to do just as well, epigraphically at least, and [23] *Numisius Sabinus* is found as part of a senator's name, later, it is true, in the Flavio-Trajanic period.³⁰⁵

If [*Calv*]isio Sabino is accepted, then, on a normal interpretation the man is a Pomponius Secundus adopted by a Calvisius Sabinus, perhaps by a C. Calvisius Sabinus, but not necessarily. The loss of the *praenomen* at the beginning of the Vindonissa inscription precludes certainty. Composite names present various problems. When a man has a double set of names, it is usually the result of adoption. He appends the original name to the new. Thus Ser. Sulpicius Galba becomes L. Livius Ocella Ser. Sulpicius Galba, and A. Julius Quadratus becomes C. Antius A. Julius Quadratus. A common practice is for one of the *praenomina* to be dropped, thus C. Antius Julius Quadratus. Therefore, when a Pomponius Secundus is adopted by a Calvisius Sabinus, one would expect the *praenomen* belonging to the latter to be omitted, that belonging to the former to be retained. Therefore, if a P. Pomponius Secundus is adopted, the *praenomen* figuring at the beginning of the composite name Calvisius Sabinus Pomponius Secundus need not be Publius. Still, there is no warrant for laying down hard and fast rules. For example, in a name like Q. Fulvius Gillo Bittius Proculus [24] the Quintus may go with Bittius Proculus. Therefore, until fresh evidence comes to light, the poet will have to be called P. (or C.) Calvisius Sabinus Pomponius Secundus. It does not follow, however, for a certainty that the poet entered into the family of the consular Calvisii Sabini. The existence of another Calvisius Sabinus, perhaps of a much lower degree, must not be forgotten.

³⁰³ CIL 13.5201.

³⁰⁴ See e.g. RE XXI, 2, 2356–60, no. 103.

³⁰⁵ CIL 3.7394 = ILS 1093.

Seneca has a string of anecdotes about a wealthy and pretentious fellow called Calvisius Sabinus. Aspiring to the delights and the glory of educated conversation—*eruditus volebat videri*—but hampered by pathological deficiencies of memory, he caused a band of slaves to be trained in literature, one expert for each of the classical authors, and relied on their help at meal times. This Calvisius Sabinus belonged to the past, but within the lifetime of Seneca—*Calvisius Sabinus memoria nostra fuit dives*. He was wealthy, and his character matched his wealth—*et patrimonium habebat libertini et ingenium*.³⁰⁶ Seneca's language, a freedman's fortune, does not of course prove that Calvisius was a freedman, perhaps the reverse. On the other hand, there is no sign that an aristocrat is being satirised, and only the chronology but none of the details [25] would appear to fit, let us say, C. Calvisius Sabinus, the consul of AD 26, legate of the military province of Pannonia. Seneca, it may be added, is prone to deriding degenerate *nobiles* for their follies or their vices. When he does so, he rams home his point, and repeats it, like any sermoniser.

This grotesque figure of caricature might be the adoptive parent of P. Pomponius Secundus. The famous tragedian was a contemporary of Seneca. He occurs nowhere in the voluminous writings of that author. Seneca also composed tragedies. A notice in Quintilian reveals a difference of opinion with Pomponius Secundus about the propriety of the phrase *gradus eliminat* in tragic verse.³⁰⁷

But it would be profitless to depend upon such conjectures; and the hazard may be still borne in mind that *Numisius Sabinus*, not *Calvisius Sabinus*, might belong to the full nomenclature of P. Pomponius Secundus. Whether or no it be held plausible that the tragedian passed by adoption into the noble family founded by the Caesarian marshal, there is no evidence that subsequent Calvisii derive from that stock. They do not bear either the *praenomen* Gaius or the *cognomen* Sabinus.

A certain P. Calvisius was consul suffect round about AD 54.³⁰⁸ This man will fit in as the parent of P. Calvisius [26] Ruso Julius Frontinus (*cos. suff.* AD 79), who belongs to the family tree of the Antonine dynasty: his son, P. Calvisius Tullus Ruso (*cos. ord.* AD 109) marries Domitia Cn. F. Lucilla and becomes the maternal grandfather of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius.³⁰⁹

³⁰⁶ Sen. *Ep.* 27.5–6: 'in our own time, Calvisius Sabinus was a rich man...he had both the wealth and the intelligence of a freedman'.

³⁰⁷ Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.31: 'unthresholds his steps'.

³⁰⁸ *CIL* 10.827 = *ILS* 6384. Cf. *RE* III, 1, 1410, n. 2.

³⁰⁹ See *RE* III, 1, 1441, no. 9 and 1413, no. 19.

Bibliographical Addenda

1. THE DIVORCE OF AEMILIUS PAULLUS

A general premise is in order about this paper, as well as about the following two in this collection. In these three studies Syme works on the assumption that mid-Republican politics revolved around a set of competing family-based factional alliances, in which marriages carried decisive political weight. As discussed in the Introduction, his debt to the work of F. Münzer is apparent throughout, and indeed explicitly stated. This approach was further developed in the 1950 and 1960s by H. H. Scullard and F. Càssola. However, it has since been widely criticised, and largely refuted, as an unhelpfully narrow and deterministic reading of a much more complex and diverse reality: see the invaluable survey of the debate in Hölkeskamp 2010: 7–10, who singles out the seminal role of M. Gelzer's review of Scullard 1951 (Gelzer 1950 = 1962: 200–10), and the important discussion in Hurlet 2012. Its fullest critique may be found in the essay on 'Factions' by P. A. Brunt (1988: 443–70 on 'pre-Sullan politics'); Crawford 1992: 22–30 is essential reading on elite competition. In what is now the reference textbook on the middle Republic, *factiones* receive barely more than a cursory discussion (Rosenstein 2012: 17–18), and recent treatments of the political history of the period tend to take a thematic angle, by focusing on areas such as legislative production or intellectual developments within the elite (cf. Flower 2010: 61–79; Märtin 2012). Questioning the value of the notion of *factiones* does not amount to denying altogether that political and personal ties between families did exist, and could in some cases be long-term ones. In a discussion of the role of the Aemilii in Roman politics and political culture ('a great tradition of glory and achievement'), Wiseman 1993: 185 (= 1998: 113–14) points out on prosopographical grounds that the Aemilii Paulli, the Fabii Maximi, and the Cornelii Scipiones maintained a close relationship for at least five generations after the adoption of the two surviving sons of Paullus into the Fabii Maximi and the Cornelii Scipiones respectively (see the stemma at 1993: 192 = 1998: 115). The title of Wiseman's study, 'The Resplendent Aemilii', is an explicit allusion to that of chapter 8 of Syme's *AA*. Aemilius Paullus' position in the history of

the Aemilii is discussed in AA 104, where his divorce is mentioned only in passing.

A number of specific aspects discussed in this paper also merit further scrutiny. Scullard 1951 gives much attention to Aemilius Paullus, who is regarded as a 'stabilizing influence in Roman life' (223), covering a middle ground between Cato and the 'extreme plebeian nobility'; his success against Perseus is the focus of a whole chapter (207–19). His marriage with Papiria receives cursory discussion (208–9), and the ties between her father, C. Papirius Maso (*cos.* 231 BC) and the Scipiones are stressed. The divorce, however, receives no discussion whatsoever, and no attempt is made to date it; cf. the brief overview of Aemilius' offspring at 209 n. 3. His election to the first consulship is tentatively explained with a 'revulsion of feeling' after the death of Scipio Africanus (170; cf. S.'s closely similar choice of words), but no reference is made to Aemilius' marital situation.

Dixon 1992: 69 argues that the divorce of Aemilius Paullus is remarkable because of his decision not to disclose its reasons; Paullus was therefore the 'precursor' of a new approach, in which divorce was no longer regarded as shameful. Lindsay 2009: 147–51 offers a useful discussion of the arrangements that were made for the adoption of the natural sons of Aemilius after his divorce and of the patrimonial consequences that they had.

Reiter 1988: 116–17 briefly discusses Paullus' divorce as an instance of his alleged lack of moral standards, and does not consider its possible political implications. The issue went largely unnoticed in modern scholarship, with the notable exception of Tansey 2011, who sought to explain Paullus' election to the consulship of 182 after a number of electoral defeats with his choice to divorce Papiria and marry a woman from an affluent family, who was able to offer him a considerable dowry and a new set of connections (187–8).

The evidence for Carvilius' divorce is gathered in Watson 1991: 23–35.

2. THE PREDOMINANCE OF THE FULVII

Scullard 1951: 177–89 devotes a close discussion to the supremacy of the Fulvii between 180 and 175 and their wider political connections across the political elite: they are regarded as the main focus of what he terms the 'middle group'. Their role in the political history of the Republic is also charted in the preceding sections: cf. also the discussion of the 'Fulvian-Claudian group' and its role in the elections for 212 (61–5). The second part of S.'s paper deals with the gradual 'eclipse' of the Fulvii, who were compelled to seek the support and partnership of other *gentes*, notably the Postumii and the Popilii: Scullard depicts the period as one of restlessness, in which inexperienced consuls were elected, and many 'newer men' showed 'increasing violence and

rapacity' (190–206, esp. 194). He is less reticent than S. in identifying broad patterns in the development of Roman politics after Pydna, although his discussion significantly focuses more on matters of provincial administration, especially in the East, than on internal politics issues. Q. Fulvius Flaccus plays a significant role in the analysis of Càssola 1962, where he is regarded as one of the foremost members of a new '*nobilitas contadina*' (331–2, 425). Càssola is keener than S. on regarding him as an associate of Fabius Maximus (336); on the other hand, he is sceptical on the existence of a compact between the Fulvii and the Claudii (330–1).

Astin 1967: 80–96 helpfully problematises the notion of an opposition between a faction rallied around Scipio Aemilianus and one led by the Appii Claudii, and argues that some individuals and families could be regarded as 'nuclei of factions' (96); cf. 94 on M. Aemilius Lepidus and S.'s argument on the Marcii in the following essay.

3. THE POLITICS OF THE MARCII

The Marcii receive cursory consideration in *RR*, where caution in matters political is singled out as their distinctive attribute (128, 517), enabling them to survive through the turmoil of the late Republic and secure a place in the elite of the early Principate. In *AA* 28, 76 he stresses their considerable ancestral prestige, which almost equated them to the patrician families; see also 403–4 on L. Marcius Philippus (*cos.* 56) and his marriage to Atia, and 397 on L. Marcius Philippus (*suff. ad* 38).

Scullard 1951 devotes some attention to the career of Q. Marcius Philippus, but does not attach much significance to his election to the consulship of 186 (see 144). His diplomatic mission to Perseus is regarded as a move of trickery, which revealed the competence of Marcius in foreign policy matters, but also raised opposition within the traditional senatorial nobility (202–3). Like S., Scullard draws attention to the connection between Marcius and the presiding magistrate of the election, A. Atilius (202). Briscoe 1964: 73–7 argues for a reassessment of the divisions that Philippus' conduct towards Perseus caused within the Senate, and advocates going beyond Roman factional politics and envisaging different approaches to the expansion in the Hellenistic world; see also Briscoe 2012: 313–18. The view is opposed by Gruen 1984: 245, who does not envisage 'groups wedded to consistent policies', and Ferrary 1988: 303, 534–5. See also Briscoe 2012: 270–305 for a close reading of Livy's evidence for Philippus' mission to Perseus. Rawson 1973: 153 (= 1991: 178–9) brings out the significance of the connection between the Marcii Philippi and Philip V. On *nova sapientia* see the sobering remarks by Dmitriev 2011: 154–6. On Marcius Philippus' co-optation to the decemvirate see Rüpke

2005: 1139 no. 2382 (= 2008: 790 no. 2382); he did not replace M. Aemilius Lepidus (no. 507 Rüpke), but C. Servilius Geminus (no. 3066 R.); cf. *MRR* 3.390 and Rüpke 2005: 86 (= 2008: 92).

Pighius' emendation *pro collegio* to Frontin. *Aq.* 1.7.5 is accepted by Rodgers 2004; cf. the commentary at 165. Gruen 1974: 146–7 views the conduct of L. Marcius Philippus during his consulship in 56 BC in opposition to the so-called First Triumvirate, and in keeping with his strong senatorial allegiance. Skutsch 1972: 14–16 discusses the tradition on Ancus' popular allegiance.

4. THE ABDICATION OF SULLA

Sulla receives some attention in *RR* (e.g. 16–23, 87–8), but the Sullan period as a whole receives hardly any consideration. This paper was certainly written after May 1945 (cf. the Editorial Note and the Introduction) and marks an attempt to provide a full discussion of the period preceding the time discussed in the 1939 book. As several cross-references make clear, it is to be read in conjunction with the papers on the *pro Roscio Amerino* and Lepidus, and was part of the same project. S. offered a more compact, but incisive discussion of Sulla's abdication in *Sallust*, 180–2, within a wider treatment of the chronology of the first book of the *Historiae*. Some of the points made in this paper are restated in that text: a critique of Carcopino's argument, a dismissive view on the value of the literary tradition on the abdication, and the emphasis on the uncertainties of the chronology of the events. Even the metaphor of the three 'pillars' of Carcopino's 'edifice' is restated (180 n. 8). By the time the book on Sallust appeared, the revisionist view of E. Badian on the date of Sulla's abdication from the dictatorship (Badian 1962a: 230) had appeared in print; S. refers to it (180 n. 9), but takes the view that Sulla resigned on the last day of his consulship in 80 BC. In the paper published here S. puts forward early 79 BC as a likelier date, while also stressing that the date is not clearly attested. The brief remark that in 80 BC Sulla was 'perhaps more' consul than dictator is also significant in that connection: like Badian, S. envisaged a gradual return to established constitutional practice.

Badian's view has found widespread acceptance (bibliography in Hinard 2008, 56 n. 74). Keaveney 2005: 165–6 takes the anecdote in Plut. *Sull.* 34 as historical and argues that a few months must have intervened between the end of Sulla's dictatorship and his consulship, possibly one or two; he also challenges the view that Sulla withdrew to private life and that he kept using his influence to his last day. Hinard 2008: 57–60 makes the attractive suggestion that the dictatorship of Sulla did not last beyond the traditional six months and ended in June 81.

Morgan 1997 devotes a lengthy discussion to the sentence attributed to Sulla in Suet. *DJ* 77.1 and suggests a new translation: ‘the *res publica* is nothing, a mere name without body and form: by resigning the dictatorship Sulla displayed an inadequate understanding of language’ (37). On this reading, the remark is best understood in the context of an intellectual debate, rather than a political statement. Cristofoli 2008: 139 is unconvinced; so are Giardina 2010: 33–4 and C. J. Smith in *FRHist* 34 F 1 (‘Sulla was ignorant of his letters’).

S.’s view on the accuracy of the compiler of the *Periochae* largely coincides with that of Brunt 1980: 488. Cf. Gabba 1958: 89–97 for the view that Appian’s account of the Sullan civil war relies on a tradition that goes back to Livy; the assessment of Sulla as a cruel tyrant, however, may have been derived from Dionysius of Halicarnassus (cf. also 109–15). Hinard 2008: 56 provides a critical assessment of Appian’s account of Sulla’s dictatorship. There has been much debate on the process that led to the appointment of Sulla to the magistracy: see Hinard 2008: 43–9, with a full summary of the bibliography.

The anecdote in which Sulla prophesies the rise of Caesar is regarded as historical by Canfora 1999: 3–4, who envisages a bitter personal hostility of Sulla towards the young patrician; Giardina 2010: 38–9 argues for a *post euentum* tradition. On Sulla’s foresight see Thein 2006: 242–4 and Giardina 2010: 39–44.

Santangelo 2016: 131–2 discusses the funeral of Sulla and its political significance in Rome and Italy. For an insightful portrayal of L. Marcius Philippus see Gruen 1974: 15. The assassination of Ofella is the consequence of one of the few instances of open opposition to Sulla’s hegemony after the Colline Gate battle: Keaveney 2003; Santangelo 2014a: 1–2. The view that Sulla established the practice of holding the consular elections in July is widely held, but there is no explicit evidence for a Sullan decision on this point, and it is more prudent to speak of a general trend (Pina Polo 2010: 284–7).

Thein 2006: 242–3 offers an original reading of Sulla’s remark on his friendship with Metellus and regards it as a symptom of the limits of his supremacy over the Roman political scene. Schietinger 2013 has argued that his connection with the Metelli dates back to the early stages of his career and is deliberately obscured by the literary tradition, which focuses instead on the unpromising beginnings of the future dictator: the evidence in support of this claim is far from compelling.

Scardigli 1983: 119 has a full discussion of Licinianus’ notice on the assignment of the governorship of Cisalpina to Sulla; she offers no solution on the dating of the event, but rightly points out that the passage records the assignment of the command, not its acceptance, and that Licinianus’ evidence is not paralleled elsewhere. Sulla’s statement on his absolute control over the property of the proscribed was of course deeply subversive, because it resorted to language that was usually applied to external enemies (Hinard 1985:

189–91). It is conceivable, as Hinard suggests (51–2) that the claim was made at a public meeting as the civil war was unfolding, possibly as early as in April 82, shortly after Sulla's arrival at Rome.

Laffi 1967: 255–77 provided an influential overview of the reception of Sulla in late Republican and Imperial literature and pointed out that the tradition was not unanimously hostile, although that is the view that did not prevail; cf. Hinard 2008: 131–45.

Gisborne 2005 explores the evidence for Sulla's interest in royal imagery; on his use of the names *Felix* and *Epaphroditos* see Santangelo 2007: 199–213.

Ryan 1998: 197–8 surveys the evidence for Catulus' standing within the Senate and concludes (against Willems) that no ancient source attests that he was *princeps senatus*. In claiming that Catulus had 'the rôle, though not the title, of *princeps senatus*', S. is perhaps implicitly accepting Mommsen's view that Sulla abolished that institution: for a refutation of that argument see Ryan 1998: 169–70 and, independently, Tansey 2000 (cf. 24 n. 47 on Catulus' position).

On Metellus Pius' governorship in Spain see Gruen 1974: 18–19 (stressing his military incompetence) and Richardson 1996: 97–9, 103 (dating the command to 79).

On Pompey's triumph see Keaveney 2005: 160–1, who dates it to March 81, and Seager 2002: 29, who argues that the choice is between 81 and 80, with a marginal preference for 81; more generally on Pompey's dealings with Sulla see Gruen 1974: 16, 44–5.

Gruen 1974: 12–17 stresses the 'ambiguity' of the political situation during Lepidus' consulship; he accepts Plutarch's account as fundamentally accurate. McGushin 1992: 153 has a good discussion of the evidence for the consular elections for 77.

Badian 1955 argued that the law recorded in *Hist.* 2.21 did not apply to Pompey, but dealt with the transfer of Cn. Pompeius Strabo's command to Q. Pompeius Rufus in 88 BC; McGushin 1994: 194–6 effectively shows that the suggestion is unlikely to be correct, while pointing out that the incident remains of difficult interpretation, not least because it is not recorded elsewhere. Hinard 2008: 57 dates it to 80 BC. Badian 1955: 108–9 argues that the emendation *et Claudio* to Frontin. *Strat.* 4.5.1 is unnecessary: *et Glaucia* is probably an interpolation, and the text should read *Servilio cohortante*.

The fullest discussion of the relevant section of Plutarch's *Life of Pompey* is Heftner 1995, which provides an extensive commentary.

5. THE SPEECH FOR ROSCIUS OF AMERIA

Cicero's *pro Roscio Amerino* has received sustained scholarly attention over the last few decades, both for its literary and rhetorical features and for the

insights it offers into the age of the Sullan proscriptions. The focus of S.'s paper, which is clearly part of a longer, unfinished sequence of studies on the age of Sulla (cf. the reference to a gradual return to orderly government, as argued more fully in the previous paper), is on two areas: the chronology of the speech and Sulla's relationship with the *nobilitas*. Like the essay on Sulla's abdication, it primarily revolves around a refutation of an argument of J. Carcopino, but eventually develops an independent line of investigation.

The *pro Roscio* has recently received a full-scale commentary (Dyck 2010) and an edition with extensive annotation (Hinard 2006). Its historical context has been explored by Lintott 2008: 60–7; see also Santangelo 2007: 82–3, 93 and 2012a: 427–30. Seager 2007 is interested in reconstructing the events that formed the matter of the case; he finds Cicero's account implausible, and suggests that Chrysogonus, Magnus, and Capito did not commit the murder, but sought the opportunity to exploit it for their own gain; the assassination was carried out by 'persons unknown' (908), and there is no evidence to connect them to his son. Hinard 1979, 1985: 149–51, and 2008: 95–106 downplays the political influence of Chrysogonus and reads the speech as piece of political positioning on Cicero's part. On the chronology of the speech see Hinard 2008: 104, who places it in early January 80. See also the evidence gathered in Alexander 1990: 66–7, no. 129. Treggiari 1969: 182–4 offers a valuable treatment of Chrysogonus' political influence.

Unlike the *Pro Roscio*, the *Pro Quinctio* remains somewhat understudied: Hinard 1975 (= 2011: 179–202) remains an important contribution of its political significance; see also Lintott 2008: 43–59. Holford-Strevens 2003: 162 briefly discusses Gell. 15.28 as evidence for Gellius' occasional reliance on Nepos; at 253–4 we are reminded that Gellius could not rely on a universally accepted era, and that his chronological inaccuracies should hold no surprise. On the chronology followed by Gellius in this instance see Stem 2012: 70–2, esp. n. 40. Wiseman 1985: 190–1 questions the view that Suetonius meant that Catullus died 'at the age of thirty', and suggests a range of possible dates: 82–53, 81–52, 80–51, 'or even a later thirty-year span'. The factual inaccuracy on Tiberius' age upon his election to the consulship was not rectified in the 1951 reprint of *RR*. On Fenestella, his chronology and his (arguably not impeccable) historical accuracy see A. Drummond, *FRHist* 70, esp. 1.489–90, 492–5. Scardigli 1983: 114 also dates the triumph of Valerius Flaccus to 81 BC. S. unduly underrated the political profile of Erucius, Roscius' prosecutor: he probably belonged to a well-to-do family of Spoletium and his son L. Erucius reached the quaestorship by 44 BC (Wiseman 1971: 230; David 1992: 762–3). On the Umbrian background of the case see Harris 1971: 271–4 and Bradley 2000: 231–6. On Cicero's need to depoliticise the case as far as conceivably possible cf. Santangelo 2007: 83. Mitchell 1979: 90–2 remains useful reading on Cicero's early years of political engagement.

The remarkable figure of Caecilia Metella receives close consideration in Schultz 2006, especially for her involvement in a major religious development during the Social War: her audience with the Senate, at which she reported a dream concerning Juno Sospita, was no business as usual. The *clientela* bond between the Metelli and Sex. Roscius is also recognised by Badian 1958: 251, who appears to extend it to the *nobiles*. Dyck 2010 prints *te nunc appello*, *P. Scipio, te, M. Metelle* at § 77—‘the simplest solution’, in S.’s view. Hinard 2006 prints *Metelle*.

On Hortensius and the Valerii cf. below the addendum to no. 17. Keaveney 2005: 166 puts a year between the death of Metella and Sulla’s encounter with Valeria. Angeli Bertinelli 1997: 410 does not rule out that Plutarch’s *autokrator* may translate *dictator* (that seems unlikely), and argues that Sulla is likely to have met Valeria before his withdrawal to private life, hence shortly after Metella’s death. The view that Crassus’ clash with Sulla during the proscriptions did cause a delay in his career has not found unanimous acceptance. Marshall 1976: 14–15 argues that the literary tradition on Crassus’ profiteering is likely to convey an exaggerated picture, and there is evidence that he consolidated his political connections throughout the Seventies. Ward 1977: 66–8 notes that the evidence for the rift between Sulla and Crassus is not immune from problems, but does argue that Crassus’ career found some obstacles in the seventies.

6. M. AEMILIUS LEPIDUS (COS. 78 BC)

The link between this paper and the previous one is apparent, and corroborates the impression that they were intended to belong in the same sequence: the opening sentence makes clear that Lepidus was the first to attempt to undo the legacy of Sulla, while the supporters of Roscius from Ameria were not targeting the victor of the civil war. The central argument of this piece is that Lepidus’ conduct during his consulship may be explained with his family connections and his factional allegiances, and that the chronology of the main literary account of the period, the first book of Sallust’s *Historiae*, manipulates the historical course of the events. This point is further developed in Sallust, 178–92. As Rosenblitt 2014: 429 n. 36 has noted, this essay clarifies S.’s reasoning in the 1964 volume in at least two important respects, notably the importance of Lepidus’ patrician background to his political rise under Sulla, and the view that there were only two candidates at the consular elections of 79 BC. In this paper S. does not question the identification of the husband of Appuleia with the consul of 78. He later expressed doubts about it (Sallust 183 n. 22) and went on to reject it outright (‘Marriage Ages for Roman

Senators', *Historia* 36 [1987], 330–1; AA 106 n. 12, 125–7, 327; 'Paullus the Censor', *Athenaeum* 65 [1987] 8 n. 2, 24).

The first section of the essay is largely preoccupied with the position of the Aemilii in the late Republican period, which is also discussed in AA 103–14. The family tradition of the Aemilii Lepidi is discussed in Weigel 1992: 5–19, who focuses on the rise of the sons of the consul of 78, and especially of the Triumvir. On M. Aemilius Lepidus Porcina see the prosopographical note in Sumner 1973: 47–8. Coarelli 1998 discusses a monument from Alba Fucens that he proposes to identify as the memorial to L. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus, the son of Lepidus; see also Santangelo 2014b: 18–20.

Much of the subsequent scholarship on Lepidus and his period has pursued a very different line to the one pursued in this paper. Gruen 1974: 12–17 argued that Lepidus was more a 'demagogue' than a 'revolutionary'. Labruna 1975 discussed Lepidus within the wider pattern of political and social developments in the late Republican period and has attempted to identify a link with the wider economic and social context of the period, especially in the Italian countryside, where Lepidus found considerable support. S. addresses the situation in Etruria only at the very end of this essay, and his main interest is in providing a summary of the military developments. For a more detailed discussion see Harris 1971: 266–7, 284–6. Santangelo 2014a discusses the events of '78 against the background of the main issues in the political debate of the seventies, notably the reform of the powers of the tribunes and the corn supply, on which Lepidus took original and independent positions. The overarching issue is the nature of the legacy of Sulla in the decade following his death, as illustrated in English-speaking historiography by the opposite positions of two leading scholars: Gruen 1974: 45 and Brunt 1988: 471–2. Rosenblitt 2014 has made a strong case for the precariousness of Sulla's political legacy in the immediate aftermath of his decision to relinquish power: in her assessment, 79 BC is already rife with tension and instability; see esp. 428–36 on the background of Lepidus' election. Burton 2014 has offered a full reconsideration of Lepidus' agenda and of the chronology for his rise to prominence. In his assessment, Lepidus was not a committed opponent of the Sullan settlement who worked for its demise. On the contrary, he was a careful political operator, whose decision to lead an Italian coalition against the Senate was driven by the twofold ambition to broaden his *clientelae* base and enable the solution of major economic and social problems across the Italian countryside.

Criniti 1970 is the fullest discussion of the Asculum decree of Pompeius Strabo in which Lepidus and Catiline are both mentioned. Badian 1962b: 53 (= 1964: 217) argued that Norba was not conquered by Lepidus, but by Mamercus Aemilius Lepidus Livianus (*cos.* 77); the view is accepted in *Sallust*, 184 n. 25, Sumner 1964: 44, and Gruen 1974: 123. McGushin 1994: 149–50, however, revives the option canvassed by S. in this paper. The view that

'something like a middle party' formed in Rome in the mid-eighties is expounded at greater length in the classic essay by Badian 1962b (= 1964: 206–34). The discussion in Lovano 2002: 53–77 is informative. Strisino 2002 offers a useful reconsideration of the talks between Sulla and L. Scipio Asiagenus; Sertorius' attack on Suessa Aurunca is regarded as a successful attempt to jeopardise any chance of a settlement. The role of L. Licinius Crassus and the evidence in the *Brutus* receives close attention in Sumner 1973: 94–7. The incident relating to the consular election of 77 reported by Sallust is discussed in McGushin 1994: 153 (with full bibliography), who rightly rules out any connection with the crisis triggered by Lepidus and the campaign against Sertorius. The position of the Cornelii Dolabellae in the Sullan period has received a full discussion in Gruen 1966 (cf. 1974: 11, 38–9). S. emphasises the dominant position of the Metelli within the Roman elite of the early first century; Twyman 1972: 836–8 also notes their rapprochement with Lepidus, and suggests enmity between the 'Sullan' Catulus and 'a somewhat amorphous political group' including Pompey and 'at least some of the Metelli', which supported the election of Lepidus.

Hinard 1985: 154–5, 169 discusses the fate of the Lepidani, who were rehabilitated much sooner than the sons of those who were proscribed by Sulla. The resurgence of patrician families in the senior magistracies in the final decades of the Republic is dealt with in *RR*, 68–70.

7. SATELLITES OF SULLA

The use of evocative names in Sallust's work is discussed, with special reference to L. Calpurnius Bestia (*tr. pl.* 62) in *Sallust* 132; cf. also 'The Damaging Names in pseudo-Sallust', *MH* 19 (1962) 177–9. The circle of aides and supporters of Sulla, however, is barely discussed in the 1964 monograph. This paper, which dates to the very period in which S. wrote his Sather Lectures volume, provides a valuable prosopographical overview of the close associates of Sulla that are mentioned in the *Oratio Lepidi*.

Keaveney 1984 provides a wide-ranging prosopographical overview of the associates and supporters of Sulla throughout his political career, which also includes the victims of the *bellum Octavianum* of 87 BC. Like S., he also regards (139) D. Junius Brutus as a shrewd political operator that negotiated his way through the fraught context of the eighties, rather than a committed supporter of Sulla. Sumner 1973: 59 also offers a useful prosopographical discussion on D. Junius Brutus Callaicus. Gruen 1974: 22 n. 45, 123 notes that he reached the consulship at a fairly advanced age and was by then no longer suited to military life. In S.'s reference to the *nobiles* who 'lurked' in Rome during Cinna's supremacy there is a striking overlap with the argument of the classic study that E. Badian produced round about the same period (Badian 1962b =

1964: 206–34). Keaveney also regards Mam. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus (1984: 138) as someone who acquiesced during Cinna's supremacy and joined Sulla at the beginning of the civil war; he is also credited with the conquest of Norba in 82 (cf. the addendum to no. 6). Gruen 1974: 123 uses Val. Max. 7.7.6 as evidence for his 'conservatism'.

Tansey 2000 reconsiders the dating of the pontifical banquet in honour of the inauguration of L. Cornelius Lentulus Niger and narrows it down to three options: 22 August 70, 69, or 68 BC. The first one appears marginally stronger.

S.'s paper, however, looks beyond the remit of the political elite, and its originality and importance lies in that approach. The gap that S. laments in the scholarship on the *Historiae* has of course been filled since by the commentary of McGushin 1992 and 1994 and more recently, for Book 1, of La Penna and Funari 2015. The *Oratio Lepidi* is *Hist.* 1.48 in McGushin's edition and 1.53 in La Penna and Funari's; see the substantial discussion in McGushin 1992: 113–25, which is only cursorily concerned with prosopographical matters, and the extensive commentary by Funari in La Penna and Funari 2015: 170–223.

Ward 1977: 238 contemplates the hypothesis that Vettius the informer may be Sallust's Vettius Picens (the connection was already made in Cichorius 1922: 161–3 and is also entertained by Gundel in *RE* VIII A and Nicolet 1974: 1071–2). Gruen 1974: 95–6, 286 and Kaster 2006: 373 discuss the activity and motives of the informer, but do not consider the possible identification with the character mentioned by Lepidus. The events in which the informer was involved occurred, at any rate, nearly two decades after Sulla's supremacy. The brief notice in McGushin 1992: 120 appears to confuse the informer and the previous owner of one of Cicero's villas at Tusculum; on the transaction see *Att.* 4.5.2 and Shatzman 1975: 404.

McGushin 1992: 120 regards *scriba Cornelius* as a freedman of Sulla who eventually managed to secure the quaestorship. Rüpke 2005: 907 no. 1305 (= 2008: 632 no. 1305) does not link the *pontifex minor* with the quaestor of 44; a gap of at least twenty-six years between the priesthood and the election to the quaestorship seems very considerable indeed.

A significant strand of economic activity involving the freedman Tarula has now become apparent (cf. 'Scorpus the Charioteer', *AJAH* 2 [1977] 86–94 at 90 = *RP* 3.1062–9 at 1066). The port of Brundisium received immunity from Sulla (App. *BC* 1.79) and the town was home to a large-scale production activity of amphorae, notably at the sites of Contrada Apani and Contrada Giancola. Stamps found in both sites bear the name of Tarula, explicitly referring to him as a freedman of Sulla: he therefore had interests in an area that had directly benefited from Sulla's decisions (evidence and discussion in Santangelo 2007: 73–4). Several stamps from Brundisium also bear the name Epicadus, although it is doubtful that they should be linked to the freedman of Sulla that was involved with the completion of his autobiography (see *FRHist*

no. 22 T 4). The likely connection between Asinius Epicadus and Pollio is recognised by Wardle 2014: 164. Scirtus remains no more than a name.

The episode involving the Bardyaei remains elusive in many details; the etymology and meaning of their name is especially obscure. Konrad 1994: 72–3 has a useful discussion and provides a fair overview of the available options on this count; he is sceptical about the identification with the Vardaei (which was argued by S. and before him in *RE* 8A.1 [1955] 365) because he finds it unlikely that Marius would have used a special force composed of Illyrians; he suggests that their name might derive from a distinctive (Illyrian?) footgear, the *bardaicus calceus* (Juv. 16.13).

Tatum 1999: 288 n. 5 defines Scato a ‘financial operative for Clodius’; at 58 he includes him in a helpful list of relatively lowly associates of Clodius and notes that the tribune of 58 was not the only prominent political figure to be able to rely on supporters from that background.

8. THE UNSPEAKABLE FUFIDIUS

The title of this brief paper, which dates to the period when S. was working on the monograph on Sallust, echoes a cursory reference to Fufidius in *RR* 249, in a cursory summary of the *Oratio Lepidi*; cf. also *RR* 78, where S. points out that Fufidius is the only attested name among the ‘formidable company of the Sullan centurions’. In *Sallust* Fufidius receives an equally rapid mention, in a discussion that emphasises the use of the word *dehonestamentum* (211; cf. also 236).

Spann 1987 argued that Plut. *Sert.* 12.3–4 should not be used as evidence that Fufidius served as governor of Hispania Ulterior, and that the governorship should be attributed to the ‘Cotta’, who was also defeated by Sertorius (in his view, C. Aurelius Cotta); Fufidius did serve in Spain, but as quaestor or legate (*archon*). Konrad 1989 has provided an alternative reconstruction that salvages Plutarch’s account: there is no factual reason to disbelieve that Sulla allowed the rise to prominence of a man of lowly origins and solid military standing like Fufidius, and it is quite possible that the Cotta who served under him was not an Aurelius Cotta, but L. Aurunculeius Cotta (see also Konrad 1994: 129–30).

Shackleton Bailey 1966: 283 also holds the view that the Fufidius from whom Cicero bought land, the knight that was penalised by Piso, and the one that is mentioned by Horace are likely to be the same person; Nicolet 1974: 882–83 argues that the matter is impossible to solve (cf. also Nicolet 1967: 302–4, focusing on the municipal background of the attested Fufidii).

The list of Italian Fufidii supplied by S. could be expanded further: see e.g. the attestations from Pompeii (*CIL* 4.7304a, 7305b, 7305c, 7308a, 7308b; *AE*

1951, 166), Canusium (*CIL* 9.338), Beneventum (*CIL* 9.2121), Aquinum (*CIL* 10.5399), and Interamna Nahars (*CIL* 11.8113.08). At least another cluster of Fufidii 'of consequence' may be identified: the Fufidii Polliones of Teanum, who reached prominent senatorial status in the Antonine period (Camodeca 2014: 260–1).

9. REX LEPTASTA (*HIST.* II, 20)

The typescript of this paper is hard to date with any precision. The bibliography does not go beyond 1958, and it is likely that this study was conceived when S. was working on the monograph on Sallust. In 1957 he published a brief note on a possible fragment of Sallust's description of Gades in the *Historiae* (Schol. in Juv. 1.10: 'A fragment of Sallust?', *Eranos* 55 (1957), 171–4 = *RP* 1.336–8), taking Plut. *Sert.* 8–9 as his starting point; cf. McGushin 1994: 219–20, who views it as a 'fragment of uncertain residence'. However, there is clear evidence that S. was reflecting further on the story of king Leptasta in the months preceding his death; it is apparent, in fact, that he was planning to produce a piece on this very topic. In the paper on 'Some Unrecognized Authors from Spain', presented at a colloquium in Madrid in December 1988 and published posthumously in *RP* VII, 463–72, he approached the dossier of Leptasta from a different angle, within a discussion of Fenestella's connection with Spain, which is discussed in the final section of this paper. At 469 n. 34 S. promises a fuller discussion of the identity of 'Etpastus' in a paper entitled 'The Paciaeci, a Family of Spanish Nobiles' (forthcoming). Birley was not able to locate this piece (cf. his editorial note, *ibid.*); it is a safe guess that the paper announced by S. would have been a development of the text that is published here. S.'s discussion is preoccupied with three interconnected issues: the role of the Paciaeci in Republican Spain; the dealings between Rome and Mauretania; and Fenestella's connection with Spain.

Konrad 1994: 109–10 offers an excellent discussion of the tradition that connected Sertorius and the Blessed Isles, providing a full overview of the bibliography. In his view, Sertorius became aware of the existence of islands in the Atlantic and exploited them as a theme in his dealings with the Celtic populations; he 'deliberately cultivated' some mythical themes for the sake of his political agenda.

McGushin 1992 publishes the *rex Leptasta* fragment as *Hist.* 2.93 and does not provide any discussion of the possible historical context of the incident it describes (255).

Gsell's tentative identification of Iphtas with Leptasta is rejected without discussion by Madjoub 2006: 261, who regards Leptasta as a 'roi maure' (265).

Gozalbes Cravioto 2010: 136–9 discusses the evidence for the nature and scope of the rule of Ascalis, whom he regards as a legitimate successor to Bocchus, but is reluctant (on chronological grounds) to include Sallust's reference to *rex Leptasta* in the dossier (138 n. 78).

González Román 2006: 305–6 has a useful prosopographical entry on L. Vibius Paciaecus, which provides a summary of the primary evidence and a discussion of the variants of the name in the manuscript tradition; he argues that Pacciaecus descended from an Italian family that had migrated to Spain, and that his *cognomen* is the blend of a Latin gentilician and an Iberian suffix. Weinrib 1990: 21–7 helpfully discusses the instances in which the involvement of Paciaecus with the affairs of the province is attested. On the attestations of Oscan *paqis*, *paci(s)*, *pakis*, and *pakis* see *Imagines Italicae* 1613–14; on the inscriptional evidence for Pacii see Camodeca 2014: 261–3. Strocchi 1996 places Pacciaecus at the core of his study of the authorship of the *Bellum Hispaniense*. In his view, the Latinity of this work suggests that the author was not a native speaker, fought in Caesar's cavalry and was personally close to the Dictator: L. Vibius Paciaecus should be identified as the writer of *Hisp.* (109–12). The suggestion is highly speculative, if impossible to disprove.

On Fenestella cf. the addendum to 'The Speech for Roscius of Ameria', no. 5, above.

10. SALLUST AND BESTIA

The portrayal of Bestia in *BC* receives a critical discussion in *Sallust*, 132–3, where its tendentiousness is stressed in strong terms. This essay takes up that very point and focuses at far greater length on Bestia's career and political allegiances. It opens with S.'s firm rebuttal of the view, propounded among others by Münzer in *RE*, that the L. Calpurnius Bestia who served as tribune in 62 and his namesake who was defended in February 56 were two different people. The view was aired in S.'s review of *MRR* I–II (*CP* 50 [1955], 127–38, at 134) and implied in *Sallust*, 132–3; it was also held, as S. points out in a footnote, by R. G. Austin in his 1955 commentary on the *Pro Caelio* (restated in the third edition, 1960: 156 n. 3). This study develops the argument at greater length. In his view, Cicero's choice to defend a man on no less than six occasions (*Cic. Phil.* 11.11; cf. Alexander 1990, nos. 249–52, 268, 269) who had bitterly attacked him a few years earlier does not pose a problem; in fact, it is not even discussed. This is, however, the main argument deployed by Gruen 1971: 67–9 in his case in favour of the separation of the two men (cf. also Gruen 1974: 300 n. 143). Cicero's allusion to Bestia's earlier attacks against him (*Sest.* 11) is also used as an argument in support: Cicero would have hardly criticised in public a man that he had just successfully defended.

Alexander (1990) tentatively accepts Gruen's argument; so do, more firmly, Crawford 1984: 143–5 and Dyck 2013: 10 n. 49. David 1992: 161, 804, 809 n. 40 argues for a reconciliation between Cicero and Bestia after 62 BC, but—unlike S.—still regards *RE* 24 and *RE* 25 as two different individuals (897 n. 1).

The identification of Metellus Nepos as the tribune that is alluded to in Cic. *Mur.* 81 is accepted by Fantham 2013: 187. Schwartz was not the first scholar to put forward the view that Sempronia was the mother of D. Brutus, as S. notes: see von Stern 1883: 124 n. 1 (cf. McGushin 1977: 302 and the addendum to no. 18, 'The Gay Sempronia'). S.'s view that Appian's account ultimately derives from Sallust (on which see also *Sallust*, 132 n. 4) requires some qualification. Carsana 2007: 41–59 provides a discussion of the account of the conspiracy in *BC* 2.2–7, gives a full bibliographical overview, and stresses the degree of Appian's independence from Sallust: the narrative must be understood against the background of Appian's compositional needs, and notably with the way in which the character of Caesar is constructed within the wider remit of a narrative of the late Republic. Cf. already Barbu 1933: 14–18.

Rawson 1982 (= 1991: 408–15) is essential reading on Cicero's *De consiliis suis*; cf. 409 for endorsement of S.'s view that *BC* should not be read as a riposte to Cicero's lost pamphlet.

David 1992: 856–8 offers a valuable overview of the evidence for M. Caelius Rufus. The prosecution against Bestia may also be alluded to in Catullus 69, where M. Caelius Rufus is mocked for his body odour, and is accused of hosting a *mala bestia* under his armpit (7–8): see Noonan 1979; Nicholson 1997: 252–3; Skinner 2011: 135.

Wardle 2014: 144 discusses the evidence for the career of Paullus Aemilius Lepidus (*cos.* 34) and the curious episode in Suetonius' biography in which he appears.

As David 1992: 897 notes, the patronising references to L. Sempronius Atratinus in the *Pro Caelio* (on which see Dyck 2013: 6–7, 71–2) are the only mentions he receives in Cicero's oeuvre; Atratinus then moved on to a remarkable career in the age of the civil wars, conveniently switching sides from Antony to Octavian at the opportune moment.

Badian 1988: 8 argued that the consul of 72 was called L. Gellius and did not have a *cognomen*; in his view, the *cognomen* Poplicola was used by his adoptive son (*cos.* 36).

The evidence for Sempronius Atratinus' augurate is listed in Rüpke 2005: 1270 no. 3008 (= 2008: 882 no. 3008); on his service in Africa see Szramkiewicz 1975: 136.

In AA 109 S. came back to *IG* 2².5179 and expressed a clearer preference than is the case in this essay: Atratina is the sister of the Antonian admiral, and her husband should be identified with the consul suffect of 34 BC. For a

different view cf. *PIR* VII, 2, 138, no. 375: the woman mentioned in the inscription is 'potius filia quam soror' of Atratinus.

SEG 30.433, from Patrae, shows that L. Sempronius Atratinus was actually married to a Marcia of the Marcii Censorini: the point is taken in *AA* 29 (cf. n. 106 in this paper).

The marriage between Paullus and Cornelia is here dated to 33 BC; in *AA* 111 and 148 and in 'Paullus the Censor', *Athenaeum* 65 (1987) 7–26 at 11–12 (= *RP* 6.247–68 at 252) S. entertains the view that it may have been slightly later ('in the vicinity of the War of Actium'), as the marriage of the consul of AD 1 with Julia may have expedited his career progression.

11. ROME AND ARPINUM

This brief note makes two broad points that are central to much of S.'s work: the ties between the Roman elite and the *domi nobiles* may shed unexpected light on familiar historical developments; and drawing conclusions based on mechanical prosopographical connections is an unhelpful operation. The similarities between two Italian small towns like Arpinum and Amiternum are evoked early on in *Sallust* (6–7, 14). S.'s main contention in this note is that the evidence for senators from Arpinum amounts to a handful of safely attested, if instructive, cases, from which only conclusions of limited import may be drawn. Nicolet 1966: 412, Nicolet 1967, and Wiseman 1971: 30–1 gave a very different assessment on the basis of the same body of evidence, and argued that there was a wave of Arpinate senators who rose to prominence after Marius, largely thanks to his connections and reputation. S.'s remarks may be read as a sobering corrective to this picture; even Wiseman, however, is mindful of the distortions that the relatively abundant evidence for the Arpinate elite is likely to create (55). Carney 1970: 8–9 discusses the evidence for intermarriage within the elite of Arpinum; see also the useful overview in Dyck 2004: 533–4 (on *Cic. Leg.* 3.36).

On Scaurus' dedication to Fufidius see *FRHist* 18 T 1; C. J. Smith (1.268) cautiously airs E. Pais' hypothesis that this Fufidius may be the associate of Sulla. His connection with Scaurus and an Arpinate origin are also regarded as plausible by Konrad 1989: 125–6, against the opposite view of Nicolet 1967: 297–301 (more bibliography at Konrad 1989: 122 n. 12).

On M. Gratidius see Nicolet 1967: 276–93 and 1974: 907 no. 173; the commentary on *Leg.* 3.36 in Dyck 2004: 532–3 is also valuable. See Nicolet 1974: 908 no. 174 and 175 on his son and grandson. The evidence for the prosecution of Fimbria by Gratidius is collected by Alexander 1990: 31 no. 61, who tentatively dates the case to 106 BC (see n. 1).

An inscription from Samothrace, dating to September 100 BC, provides further evidence for L. Tullius Cicero's service in Cilicia under M. Antonius: Clinton 2001 (= *SEG* 51.1092).

Crawford 1968 and 1985: 187–91, and Lo Cascio 1979: 215–18, 234–8 have conclusively disproved the image of Gratidianus as a demagogue and have shown that his edict on currency was led by serious financial considerations and restored a degree of public trust in the coinage, although their assessments of the remit and significance of that measure are considerably different; see also Hollander 2007: 29, 111–12 and Kay 2014: 249–51. Marshall 1985b: 128–33 questioned with plausible, if inevitably speculative arguments Catiline's responsibility for the gruesome execution of Gratidianus and casts the blame at Catulus' door. He is also sceptical (128), albeit with far less cogent arguments, on the possibility that Catiline married a Gratidia (see below, no. 13).

On C. Visellius Varro see Sumner 1973: 138–9. The connection of the Visellii with Arpinum is restated by Licordari 1982: 22–3; Wiseman 1971: 275 no. 501 is more cautious, pointing to the presence of a Varro at Arpinum in 54 (Cic. *Q. Fr.* 3.1.4). On the Caesii of Arpinum see the overview by Panciera 1981: 119–20 (= 2006: 810, 822). There is a full, if brief entry on C. Attius Celsus from Amiternum in 'Senators, Tribes and Towns', *Historia* 13 (1964) 105–25, at 113, and a sketch on T. Fadus at 116. See also at 106 the general remark on the lack of epigraphically attested Gratidii at Arpinum and Sallustii at Amiternum. More evidence on the Fadii is listed in 'Who was Vedius Pollio?', *JRS* 51 (1961), 23–30, at 24 n. 19.

12. THE CONSULAR ELECTIONS, 70–66 BC

The evidence for the elections discussed in this paper is now presented in tabular form and with a brief discussion in Badian 1990: 393. The fullest discussions of the period remain Gruen 1974: 47–82 and Wiseman 1994—the latter being very different in focus and emphasis from Syme's treatment, but retaining a comparably keen interest in the detail of political and institutional developments.

The opening statement on Catiline's decision not to stand in the first election of 66 is contested. Seager 1964: 338–9 argued that Catiline was prevented from standing at the supplementary elections of replacements for Sulla and Autronius; the view is also accepted by Sumner 1965, who regards the evidence of Sallust and Cassius Dio as wholly persuasive. Ramsey 1982: 122 n. 3 remarks that Asconius' unusually vague statement could apply to either of the elections that took place in that year. He also argues that Catiline

stood in the second election for the consulship of 65. The view is accepted by Berry 1996: 271 in his discussion of Cic. *Sull.* 68.4.

In this paper S. states that eleven consulars were alive in 71: elsewhere (RP 6.326 and AA 25) he claimed that there were in fact twelve, on the basis of Sumner 1964: 47, who argued that Mam. Lepidus Livianus was still alive in that year. This detail may provide a clue to the dating of this piece.

Sumner 1973: 127 does not express a firm view on the date of Turius' consular candidature. On Palicanus see the brief note in Sumner 1973: 199 and the full discussion in Yakobson 1999: 162–4.

Dyck 2012: 15–16 discusses the likely outcome of Fonteius' prosecution and argues that the sale of a property in Naples to a M. Fonteius (*Att.* 1.6(2).1) in November 68 suggests an acquittal.

Richardson 1996: 104–6 surveys the rather scarce evidence for Spain in the sixties and detects signs of the development of a more settled administrative framework, at least in Hispania Ulterior.

Badian 1984: 67–8 is sceptical on the value of the entry of the Chronographer of 354 that records the suffect consulship of a Vatia in 68 BC: although a connection with P. Vatia (*cos.* 79) may not be ruled out, he deems it safer to rule that source out of account altogether. Wiseman 1974: 177 n. 3, 182–3 tentatively regards '(C.) Vatia' as the elder brother of the consul of 79.

On C. Calpurnius Piso see Sumner 1973: 128, who is inclined to date his praetorship to 71.

The anomalous titulature of the inscription from Miletus where a Torquatus is mentioned no longer poses a problem: a check by P. Herrmann on the stone showed that the title is not the otherwise unattested *πρεσβευτής καὶ ἀνθύπατος*, but the perfectly common *πρεσβευτής καὶ ἀντιστρατηγός* (i.e. *legatus pro praetore*); an unfortunate *lapsus calami* of Wiegand, the inscription's first editor, caused a scholarly puzzle that remained open for nearly eighty years (Thomasson 1987; *Inscripfen von Milet*, VI, 3 [Berlin 2006] n. 1121; cf. *MRR*, Suppl. 72–3 for a new attempt to reconstruct the career of L. Manlius Torquatus, *cos.* 65).

The Cominii were from Spoletium and very little indeed is known about their family background: see David 1992: 827–9.

13. CATILINA'S THREE MARRIAGES

This short piece deals with an aspect that does not receive close discussion in *Sallust*: at 85–6 S. concentrates on the literary effect that Sallust sets out to achieve by concentrating on the third wife of Catiline and the circumstances of her encounter with him: Catiline's alleged murder of his own son serves as an effective lead into the account of the making of the plot.

Marshall 1977: 152 n. 1 and 1985b: 128 radically contested the view that Catiline married three times on the basis of a twofold argument from silence: if he had married a Gratidia, and subsequently killed two brothers-in-law (Caecilius and Gratidianus) the surviving sources would likely make reference to that; and surely Cicero would have had to acknowledge a family connection with the man he accused of conspiring against the *res publica*. McGushin 1992: 105–6 takes a different view and offers a useful summary of the bibliography; La Penna and Funari 2015: 161 also see a likely allusion to Catiline in Sall. *Hist.* 1.45 M. Treggiari 2007: 23–4 offers a useful discussion of the connection between Catiline and the Gratidii.

The divorces of Pupius Piso and Pompey in the late eighties are linked with one another by Gruen 1969: 168–9, who also stresses Piso's later loyalty to Pompey, well into the sixties (167).

On the adoption of Cn. Aufidius Orestes (*cos.* 71), originally an Aurelius Orestes, into the Aufidii see Cic. *Dom.* 55 and Gruen 1974: 127 n. 22. Cn. Aufidius' historical work was entitled *Epitomae* (OGR 18.4) and might have been in Greek. That is a distinct possibility, not a certainty as stated by S.: see *FRHist* 17, esp. the introductory note by C. J. Smith. On Cn. Aufidius Orestes see Mathieu 1999: 74, 129–31, who stresses that there is no evidence for links between him and Sulla's faction.

Balsdon's view that Caesar became sterile at some point during his adult age receives a full critique in 'No Son for Caesar?', *Historia* 29 (1980) 422–37 (= *RP* 3.1236–50).

Keaveney 2005: 161, 172–3 develops the account of Plut. *Pomp.* 9 and suggests that in 81 Sulla was very keen to forge a marriage connection with Pompey in the hope that he would defend his political legacy after his departure from power. Sulla therefore set Pompey's divorce from Antistia as a condition for the granting of a triumph, and Pompey's first marriage played a considerable part in enabling his political rise. Seager 2002: 174 is open to that suggestion.

Aurelia Orestilla's distinguished lineage (on which cf. S.'s closing remarks) is helpfully charted by Evans 1987: the Aurelii Orestes achieved the consulship across four consecutive generations. Marshall 1977 dates her marriage to Catiline to the mid-sixties, largely on the basis of the connection between Catiline and her relative Q. Mucius Orestinus (*tr. pl.* 64); see also Marshall 1985b: 128.

The view that Asconius missed the allusion to Aurelia Orestilla is also voiced in *Sallust*, 85, and accepted in Marshall 1985a: 311 and (somewhat more cautiously) in Lewis 2006: 301. McDermott 1969: 242–3 notes that when he wrote the commentary on *In toga candida* Asconius was not familiar with Sallust's *BC*.

Asconius' comment on Piso's mother-in-law is rightly read by Lewis 2006: 205 as an indication that he did not number himself among historical writers.

14. CRASSUS, CATILINA, AND THE VESTAL VIRGINS

The case of Catiline's relationship with the Vestal Virgin Fabia receives only tangential attention in *Sallust*: at 86 it is briefly mentioned as one of the '[n]ot very convincing examples of the "multa nefanda stupra"' (BC 15.1) allegedly perpetrated by Catiline in Sallust's account, which S. finds on the whole underpowered in this section of his work.

At *Sallust*, 88–9 S. states that it was 'natural to assume' that Piso was sent to Spain by Crassus (cf. also 100). Gruen 1968: 159–60 also stresses the connection between Cn. Calpurnius Piso and Crassus, as well as Piso's likely enmity with Pompey, which may have been exacerbated by his ambition to extend his family *clientelae* in Spain and may have played a part in his death.

The evidence for the case of 73 is summarised by Alexander 1990, no. 167 and, more fully, in Cadoux 2005: 162–3. Gruen 1971: 60–1 is especially interested in what it may reveal about Clodius' early career and his clash with Cato, which was perhaps the cause of their later enmity. The possibility that the case of 73 may evidently be a link between Catiline and Crassus is not entertained by Marshall 1976: 13, who focuses on the possible economic motives of Crassus' alleged relationship with the Vestal. Ward 1977: 74–6 also discusses the case in that connection; like S., he stresses that the prosecutor was likely to be driven by political hostility: however, he suggests that Plotius may not have been the tribune of 70 BC, but A. Plautius, who served as a legate of Pompey in 67 BC. The political connection between the two men did not emerge before the mid-sixties (136). In this paper S. saw the possible link between Licinia and Licinius Murena, which was also pointed out by Marshall 1976: 22 n. 86.

Plut. *Cat. Min.* 19.3 has often been read as evidence that Clodius was the prosecutor of the Vestal Fabia and Catiline: Moreau 1982: 232–39 offers a list of compelling objections to this reading (full bibliography at 233 n. 703) and proposes to relate the passage to the events of 61 BC. Tatum 1999: 44 accepts this view.

Curiously enough, the fullest studies of this topic were produced by two immediate colleagues, who reached rather different conclusions on a number of points: Lewis 2001 and Cadoux 2005. Lewis 2001: 141 and Cadoux 2005: 162 float the possibility that there were more than two defendants for that offence in 73. Lewis also stresses a fundamental difference between the position of Crassus, who was acquitted, and Catiline, for whom no formal acquittal verdict was pronounced, and nonetheless managed to elude a conviction. He also follows Moreau in denying that Clodius was involved with the prosecution of Catiline (147–8); in his view, neither the wording of Plut. *Cat. Min.* 19.3 nor his young age warrant that hypothesis. Clodius perhaps criticised the outcome of the prosecution. Cadoux (2005) offers the fullest

treatment of the problem to date, and sees a link (at least of the circumstantial kind) between the cases of Catiline and Clodius (167–8); he also points out that the argument that Catiline was not formally charged or acquitted has considerable weaknesses (170–1). Cadoux is sceptical on the involvement of Clodius with the prosecution case, and argues that he mentioned the case some time later in public meetings, openly questioning the decisions of the pontiffs that heard the case (173–9). This in turn raises an issue of chronology: Cadoux suggests (179) that the prosecution against Crassus may have been launched in the early stages of the slave war, in the tense climate that accompanied Rome's initial lack of progress in the campaign.

The oracle on the three Cornelii must be understood against the backdrop of systemic disruption in public religion during the late Republican period (not to be read as evidence for decline), and against a wider shift towards prophetic divination: for a fuller discussion cf. Santangelo 2013a: 144–5, 185–6.

Treggiari 2007: 30–1 notes that the evidence for the relationship between Cicero and his sister-in-law Fabia is minimal. However, he was careful to exonerate her from any blame in the reference he made to the case of 73 in *Cat.* 3.9, and his wife Terentia found refuge in the residence of the Vestales in 58. On Cicero's silence see also *Sallust*, 84 and Cadoux 2005: 172.

On Murena's political trajectory see Brennan 2000: 577 and Fantham 2013: 6–8. Fonteia's status as Vestal Virgin was an asset to Cicero's case in favour of her brother, which is duly exploited in the speech (*Font.* 46–7; see Dyck 2012: 78–9). On L. Arruntius' work see *FRHist* 58, esp. 1.448–50 (B. M. Levick on his biography).

Richardson 1996: 109 stresses that Piso's despatch to Spain was widely backed in the Senate and regards Sallust's account as suspicious; late Republican anxieties over the recurrent role of Spain in civil wars will have lent it a degree of plausibility. Brennan 2000: 514 dates Pupius' governorship in Spain to 70 and '(surely) part of 69'. At 516 he notes—as S. also did—that Piso's death will have made the task of blaming him for involvement in the conspiracy easier. He also argues (516, 855–6 n. 340–8) that he was of quaestorian rank and received the province of Hispania Citerior *extra sortem*, as a result of a concerted political operation in which Crassus was central.

Stone 2013 produces a compelling case for dating the praetorship of Crassus to 75.

Gruen 1974: 282–3 stresses that Autronius had many enemies and was an attractive target for prosecution, but does not point to a connection with Crassus. Gruen 1969a: 22 and Berry 1996: 7 n. 39 rule it out altogether on the basis of *Sall. Cat.* 48.7.

On Sex. Iulius Caesar's membership of the pontifical college see Rüpke 2005: 1063 no. 2009 (= 2008: 737 no. 2009).

15. SALLUST ON CRASSUS

This note provides a clearer focus on Sallust's assessment of Crassus than is the case in the comments included in *Sallust*, where the incident of 4 December is briefly discussed (103–4); at 23 the possibility of a political connection between Sallust and Crassus is firmly ruled out, against Büchner (esp. in light of BC 48.4).

Ward 1977: 178–92 provides an extensive discussion of the evidence for Crassus' conduct during the Catilinarian crisis; on his reading (which is based on a sceptical assessment of Sallust's evidence), Crassus' main concern was to secure a strong position ahead of Pompey's return. While he may have had an interest in precipitating the crisis in order to be granted the power to address it in association with Caesar, he was not personally involved with the conspiracy. Marshall 1976: 80–1 offers a more prudent assessment and points out that there is no compelling evidence that Crassus was taking hostile actions ahead of Pompey's return. Unlike S., who explains Sallust's hostility to Crassus with his contempt for Sulla's legacy, Marshall argues that Sallust accepted Cicero's bias (174–5).

Wiseman 1964: 123 and 1971: 109 uses the very evidence of Asc. 82.9 to show that Licinius Sacerdos and Cornificius were men of obscure senatorial family, rather than *novi homines*; see also Marshall 1985a: 282–3 and Lewis 2006: 289–90.

Fantham 2013: 156–8 offers a very informative discussion of Cic. *Mur.* 50–1. Marshall 1985a: 286 and Lewis 2006: 291–2 see careful innuendo on the involvement of Crassus and Cicero on Cicero's part in the passage of *In toga candida* discussed in Asc. 83.18.

Q. Arrius might have been among the senators recruited by Sulla in 81 (Santangelo 2006: 17, 21). His connection with Crassus appears to have lasted until the Parthian campaign (Marshall-Baker 1975: 225–30; Marshall 1976: 167 n. 63), although the Gronovian Scholiast (*ad Div.* 3.324 Stangl) has him die in 72 or 71 on his way to Sicily (Gruen 1974: 74 accepts this version and argues that Crassus' friend was not praetor in 73; *contra* Sumner 1973: 130). Ward 1977: 185 n. 43 summarises the problem. On Arrius' involvement in the Spartacus campaign see Brennan 2000: 432–4.

The authenticity of the *Invective against Cicero* is now widely ruled out: see the recent edition by Novokhatko 2009 and the discussion in Santangelo 2012b. The emendation of *M. Crassi* with *C. Mari* was contested by Rawson 1976 (= 1991: 223–6), who advocates *L. Crassi*; this argument has been accepted by Massa 2006: 433 n. 55 and Novokhatko 2009: 31; there is also a valid case for *M. Crassi* (Santangelo 2012b: 35 n. 31).

Tatum 1999: 234–6 stresses the contingent convergence of interests between Clodius and Pompey in the election for the consulship of 52: their shared priority was to prevent the election of Milo.

Seager 2002: 39 views the reconciliation between Pompey and Crassus as a hollow gesture, which Pompey readily accepted because Crassus took the initiative; on the other hand, Crassus' choice to praise his rival in public earned him much public attention, as Ward 1977: 109.

Ward 1977: 105 does not comment on the tone of *Hist.* 4.51, but argues that Sallust's account must be fundamentally accurate.

16. SALLUST'S LIST OF CONSPIRATORS

This paper—the shortest among those published in this collection—is clearly an offshoot of the monograph project on Sallust. It covers an angle that receives attention in that work, but not as a free-standing section. In the 1964 book much attention is taken up by the role of P. Sulla in the conspiracy and by the motives that led Sallust to exonerate him from any involvement (88–94; cf. also the remark on their participation in the African operations in the civil war at 71). The position of L. Calpurnius Bestia is indeed discussed in a separate section of the book (132–3). The value of this piece lies in the brief overview of the attested conspirators that it provides; it is therefore a contribution to the reconstruction of a specific series of events and on the biographies of specific individuals. The commentary by Ramsey 2007: 104–7 provides more systematic guidance on each individual under discussion in Sallust's text, but is no substitute for the discursive overview provided by S. here. Gruen 1974: 418–21 offers a list of the supporters of the conspiracy, largely based on Sallust.

Shortly before the appearance of *Sallust*, and clearly too late for S. to take the argument into account, Linderski 1963 (= 1995: 224–5, 650) provided a brief discussion of the social standing of Vargunteius, who is mentioned as a senator by Sallust, but may be identified as a knight on the evidence of a brief allusion by Cicero (*Cat.* 1.9)—a problem that S. does not address. In Linderski's view, Vargunteius was expelled from the Senate after a conviction on *ambitus* charges (*Sull.* 6) in 66 BC, and that fall into disgrace played a major role in determining his decision to join the conspiracy. Gruen 1974: 419 accepts this reconstruction; Nicolet 1974: 1060–1 is sceptical. Berry 1996: 141 accepts this scenario, but rightly stresses that the dating of the conviction remains conjectural (cf. *Sallust*, 88 n. 23: 'can conveniently be assigned to 66 BC'; evidence and brief discussion in Alexander 1990, no. 202); see also Ramsey 2007: 105. Linderski's argument that the contemporary evidence of Cicero for Vargunteius' status should be preferred to Sallust's is sound, and was already seen by Leonardo Bruni in his *Cicero novus* (1415): he largely based his account of Catiline's conspiracy on Sallust, but parted company with his main authority on this point (Fryde 1983: 46).

Shackleton-Bailey 1960: 52 suggested to emendate the crux †*Furnius*† as *Fulvius*; cf., however, his later preference for *Furius Crassipes* in Shackleton-Bailey 1966: 277.

17. P. SULLA (COS. CAND. 66 BC)

A whole chapter of *Sallust* is devoted to the ‘credulity of Sallust’ (83–102), and at 90–1 his decision to exonerate P. Sulla from any involvement with the conspiracy is included in the discussion; their mutual knowledge is also invoked as a likely explanation (cf. 36–7, 71).

The reference overview of P. Sulla’s life and career is now Berry 1996: 1–13; see 320–1 for a conclusive demonstration that he was the nephew of the dictator. Cf. the discussion of P. Sulla’s connection with Pompey at 3, esp. n. 11: the marriage with Pompeia (suggested in *Sallust*, 102 n. 88) is ‘highly probable’, but not certain. Ward 1977: 28–9 points out that Pompey’s quaestor was probably the son of L. Memmius (*praetorius* in 129) and that the tribune of 54 was a son of an unrecorded son of C. Memmius (*tr. pl.* 111). A similar prosopographical quandary affects the later stage of Sulla’s career. Shackleton-Bailey 1966: 296 and Berry 1996: 12 argue that P. Sulla did not lead the right wing of Caesar’s army at Pharsalus, but that the task was entrusted to his son.

On the connection between Hortensius, his nephew M. Valerius Messalla Rufus (*cos.* 53), and Valeria cf. the different reconstruction in Twyman 1972: 834 n. 80, who suggests that she may be the sister of M. Valerius Messalla Niger (*cos.* 61), and therefore Hortensius’ half-sister; that would be consistent with Plut. *Sull.* 35.4. S. restated the view that Valeria was Hortensius’ niece in AA 227; accepted by Angeli Bertinelli 1997: 409–10.

Zevi 1995: 18–24 sheds light on the involvement of P. Sulla at Pompeii and his activity in town in the run-up to the conspiracy. See also Santangelo 2007: 161–5 on the political and administrative developments after 80 BC.

There is no evidence whatsoever for P. Sulla’s father, but his death may be placed with some confidence between 107 and 96 (Reams 1986–87: 305) in light of the career of P. Sulla’s half-brother, L. Caecilius Rufus. Autronius’ connection with Crassus is doubtful: see the addendum to no. 14.

Gruen 1969a: 22 and Berry 1996: 6–8 reasonably point out that the candidatures of Sulla and Autronius should not necessarily be regarded as an instance of the struggle between Pompeians and non-Pompeians.

The circumstance that Clodius used Sulla’s house as a base in 57 is viewed by Berry 1996: 11 as evidence that Sulla ‘no longer felt indebted to Cicero’; this reading seems preferable to S.’s.

18. THE GAY SEMPRONIA

The remarkable character of Sempronia receives close attention in S.'s monograph on Sallust, albeit far more cursorily than is the case in this paper. It is also frequently mentioned throughout S.'s oeuvre (see e.g. *Tacitus*, Oxford 1958, 567; 'Bastards in the Roman Aristocracy', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 104 [1960], 323–7 = *RP* II, 510–17, at 516–17, which dates to the time when S. was writing the Sather Lectures on Sallust). In the 1964 monograph S. stresses that the digression on Sempronia is all the more surprising, since she plays no part in the rest of the action narrated in the work, with the exception of her house being made available for the conspirators (40.5, at 69). The choice of the character, however, attracts greater attention in the book as well as in this piece: the connection with D. Brutus and that with Fulvia are given considerable emphasis (134–5), whereas Münzer's suggestion on the connection with C. Gracchus receives hardly any attention (134 n. 54). The end of the Fulvii, which is the subject of another essay published in this volume (no. 19), is briefly evoked (135). S. returned to the theme in later publications. In 'No Son for Caesar?' (*Historia* 29 [1980], 422–37 = *RP* 3.1236–50, at 1242–4) he renewed his conjectures about the parentage of D. Brutus, and briefly reverted to Sallust's Sempronia and her family relationships in 'Princesses and others in Tacitus' (*G&R* 28 [1981], 40–52 = *RP* 3.1364–75, at 1371), and in *AA*, 18, 26, 198–9. However, his claims for the identification of Sempronia as sister to Fulvia's mother became increasingly cautious: 'there is a chance that she might be an aunt of Fulvia' (*RP* 3.1371); 'there may be a close link with the bold and ambitious Fulvia' (*AA* 26).

The cursory reference in *Tacitus* (esp. 567 n. 6) betrays some sympathy towards Schwartz's view that Sempronia was the mother of one of the Liberators, and that her prominence in Sallust's account must be explained with that family connection (cf. the addendum to 'Sallust and Bestia', no. 10). A few years later, as is apparent from *Sallust* (133–6), S. changed his view on two crucial points: he favoured the option that D. Brutus' mother might have been a Postumia, and Sempronia thus only his stepmother (cf. 'Bastards in the Roman Aristocracy', quoted above); and he set out to explain Sempronia's prominence in *Cat.* with her own family background. He did not embrace Münzer's hypothesis that she was the daughter of C. Sempronius Gracchus, and conjectured instead that she was a descendant of C. Sempronius Tuditanus (*cos.* 129). In a paper never cited by Syme (Ciaceri 1929/1930: 224–30), E. Ciaceri had identified her as a daughter of the consul; S. suggested that she was his granddaughter, sister to 'Sempronia, daughter of Tuditanus', attested by Asconius (40) as accompanying her daughter Fulvia in 52 at the trial of Milo for the killing of Clodius, Fulvia's first husband. In his reconstruction, Sallust's

Sempronia is related to the wife of the Triumvir Antony. The paper that is published here develops at greater length this prosopographical argument.

S.'s view that D. Brutus was in fact the stepson of Sempronia has not met with unanimous support. Dettenhofer (1992) 72–4 does not discuss it (although she is aware of S.'s work on Sempronia); Canfora (1993: 73) is unconvinced, takes up Schwartz's view, and argues that the connection between Catiline's conspiracy and one of the Liberators would have been a substantial reaction to the argument of Cicero (*Phil.* 2.28), who drew a sharp contrast between the two conspiracies. The fullest discussion of Sempronia's family background and of the related prosopographical problems is Cadoux 1980. At 103–4 Cadoux argued that a connection between Sempronia and D. Brutus is unlikely, as Sallust would not have missed the opportunity to stress it explicitly and would not have argued that Sempronia was 'fortunate enough in her children' (25.2: *liberis satis fortunate*; S. quotes, but does not discuss Cadoux's argument in AA 26). This approach seems to downplay the complexity of Sallust's project and his ability to effectively use literary and narrative devices. At 105–10 he noted that Syme's suggestion is preferable to those of Münzer and Ciaceri, because it places Sempronia in the right generation: Sallust's portrayal does not befit a woman who is approaching her sixties. More importantly, Cadoux issues a crucial cautionary note: while she could, as Syme conjectured, have belonged to the Sempronii Tuditani, at least four other sufficiently distinguished branches of the *gens Sempronia* were extant in the late Republic. Cadoux' main claim (116–20)—i.e. that Sallust chose to single out Sempronia because he knew her and found her very impressive—also seems unduly reductive. On the other hand, the point has a sobering side that is worth not overlooking: arguing, like Syme does, that the character of Sempronia was intended as an attack on her niece Fulvia, the wife of Mark Antony, requires a leap of faith.

Levick (2015: 57) seems open to the hypothesis of a connection between Gaius Gracchus and Sempronia, and intriguingly (though speculatively) points out that the other major female figure in *BC*, Fulvia, was a relation of M. Fulvius Flaccus (*cos.* 125), a close ally of Gracchus. The speculative suggestion of Duval (1991), who argued that Sempronia was a lover of Caesar and that D. Brutus may have been an illegitimate son of the Dictator, has found no support.

Paul (1985: 10–11) was equally uninterested in establishing the identity and historical significance of Sempronia and conversely focused on the literary and artistic function of her portrait, which develops a construction of her femininity that is as disturbing as it is extraordinary in the context of ancient historiography. Moreover, the portrait of Sempronia may be read as balancing that of Catiline in ch. 4 from a structural standpoint: it is preceded by a lengthy discussion of the background of the conspiracy, and occurs immediately before the account of the elections of 63 and the unfolding of the conspiracy.

Indeed, in this essay S. does not just single out the portrayal of Sempronia as one of the most substantial features of *BC*. He regards it as a shrewd device to fill a gap in the narrative, notably between the elections of 64 and those of 63, and 'lend variety' (133) by sketching a female counterpart to Catiline. The view that Sempronia is a counterpart to Catiline, however, has found wide acceptance: see the extensive bibliography in Boyd 1987: 183–4 n. 2. Several scholars, however, have emphatically disagreed and regarded the isolated appearance of this noblewoman in the monograph as a composition flaw: this is the view, for instance, of McGushin 1977: 303 (cf. Pagán 2009: 43 on the allegedly stereotypical and one-dimensional nature of this portrayal). Good-year (1982: 101) took an even more radical line: far from being a counterpart to Catiline, Sempronia is first and foremost a superb literary sketch, which Sallust either found too successful to jettison, or too attractive to readers interested in gossip to be done away with. Either way, its inclusion in the monograph is a betrayal of the Thucydidean allegiance of Sallust's project. The close analysis by Woodman (1988: 122–4) brings out the stylistic and literary complexity of the passage, and singles it out as a prime example of the un-Ciceronian stylistic choices of its author (cf. Krostenko 2001: 70–1 on the textual parallels between the portrait of Sempronia and the Elder Cato's sarcastic attack on M. Caelius in *ORF*⁴ F115).

Boyd 1987 has taken issue with the reading of Sempronia as Catiline's female counterpart: she is 'both Catiline's complement and his ironic reverse' (185). The extent to which this reading is innovative will not be apparent to everyone, but Boyd's analysis has two fundamental merits. First and foremost, it stresses that the construction of the character of Sempronia is tied up with Sallust's wider reflection on gender and the role of women and femininity in Roman society. Sempronia is far removed from the domestic sphere, and that gives the measure of how threatening and perverse she is. Secondly, Boyd aptly notes the prominent place of Sempronia's portrayal in the overview of the members of the conspiracy: it is the closing piece of a masterful overview, in which the female associates of Catiline take a major role, and in which Sempronia is especially singled out. Far from being a symptom of compositional sloppiness, and regardless from any considerations on its historical accuracy, it is a central piece in the fabric of the whole work.

Quite apart from these historiographical considerations, Sempronia has also attracted the interest of scholars working on constructions of gender and social relations—an aspect that is peripheral to S.'s concerns. Hemelrijk (1999: 85) notes that Sallust's depiction of Sempronia 'obscures her actual personality and behaviour' and effectively turns her into a literary construction; see also 17, 174–5 on the ambiguous role that education plays in her portrayal. Milnor (2009: 280) has focused on the emphasis that Sallust places on Sempronia's 'manly daring' (*uirilis audacia*) and on the subversion of gender conventions that she embodies, and is in turn mirrored by the

effeminacy of many male supporters of Catiline. Shelton (2013: 116–17) argues that Sallust resented Sempronia's intellectual accomplishments; she also stresses the importance and novelty of that motif (121–2). Stratton (2007: 77–9) notes that some features of Sallust's depiction of Sempronia may be found in later depictions of witches who perform magic.

On the marriage of Brutus and Clodia, it is worth noting that, if one accepts Münzer's hypothesis, Crassus Mucianus became the stepfather of C. Gracchus' wife Licinia (not of Gracchus himself).

19. THE END OF THE FULVII

S., AA 16 comes back to the disappearance of the Fulvii from the Fasti and links it to the Sempronii Gracchi, and explains it with the 'mishaps in political life' that both families had encountered.

In this piece he stresses the diversity of the coalition that rallied behind Marius in the eighties; the evidence for the involvement of scores of new men is less strong than is argued here, although Wiseman 1971: 30–1 sees a link between the success of some Arpinate senators in the first century BC and Marius' achievements (cf. *supra* the note on 'Rome and Arpinum', no. 11).

For a recent reading of SIG³ 748 from Gytheum see Santangelo 2008.

The evidence for the successful prosecution of Milo by Neratus is in Alexander 1990: no. 311. David 1992: 835 suggests that he came from a family of *negotiatores*.

On the purge of the Senate carried out by the consuls of 70 BC see Gruen 1974: 44.

20. CAESAR AS PONTIFEX MAXIMUS

No manuscript or clearly dated typescript survives for this paper. Birley tentatively dates it to the 1960s (1999: xvi). It is likely to be earlier: the most recent scholarly work mentioned in the footnote is the second edition of Gelzer's biography of Caesar (published in 1941). It is surely also significant that there is no reference to L. R. Taylor's articles on Caesar's colleagues on the pontifical college (Taylor 1942a), where the study of a priesthood is used as a vantage point on the political history of Rome in the mid-first century BC and a comparable assessment of Caesar's engagement with his priestly office to S.'s may be found (cf. also Taylor 1942b: 7–8 and the later discussion in Taylor 1949: 76–97, esp. 92–3, on Caesar's election), and on the election of the *pontifex maximus* in the late Republic (Taylor 1942c). The polemical allusion

at the end of the paper reveals that the piece was written primarily as a riposte to the assessment of Caesar's pontificate provided by J. Carcopino in his 1934 volume on Roman imperialism; a scathing reference to the 'accumulated dynamism' of Caesar's priesthood may also be found in S.'s review of Gelzer's *Caesar* (JRS 34 [1944], 92–103, at 97–8 = *RP* I, 149–71, at 160). Ostensibly, this paper appears to have been planned in the first half of the 1940s, although a later composition date may not be ruled out. It is impossible to prove whether this piece may have been intended as an attempt to engage with Momigliano's criticism on the lack of attention to the religious dimension in *RR* (JRS 30 [1940], 76), in the same way in which the papers on the Sullan period may be viewed as an attempt to engage with Momigliano's critique on periodisation.

Caesar's highest pontificate has received relatively little attention in modern scholarship, and this paper remains to this day one of the few specific discussions of this aspect in the religious history of the late Republic. Huber 1971 offers a learned full-scale treatment. Canfora 2014 has recently produced an overview of Caesar's 'religious career', pointedly reading it as an aspect of his political trajectory. On his interpretation, Caesar was a committed sceptic on religious matters, no less than Polybius, and his attitude was widely shared within the Roman political elite. However, his election to the highest pontificate was a major political coup, which placed in a domain that was close to the archaic powers of the kings. There are, independently, some remarkable overlaps with S.'s approach. Most students of this period would now take a different line, both on the interrelation between politics and religion in Republican Rome and on the views that were held within the elite on religious matters (cf. Tatum 2008: 65 on the limits of Polybius's evidence in this respect). Wardle 2009 provides a balanced and wide-ranging discussion of Caesar's attitude to religion, in which the tenure of the highest pontificate plays a central, but not dominant role, and emphasis is put on Caesar's apparent respect for correct religious procedure and on how little evidence there is for his alleged role to bring about radical change within public religion, including in the background of the deification. Wardle also offers an assessment of religion in Caesar's literary works (on which cf. also Santangelo 2013a: 112–14) and provides a strong overview of previous scholarship. Caesar's ostensible commitment to tradition was already stressed by Weinstock 1971: 28–34, who discussed the highest pontificate within a wider treatment of Caesar's priestly offices. As is well known, Weinstock's overall argument is that Caesar set out to establish his own cult during his own lifetime; on his reading, his position of *pontifex maximus* enabled him to make a crucial addition to the pontifical college by appointing Mark Antony to the flamine of *Divus Julius* (305–7, 392). Alföldi 1975: 159, 179 rightly pointed out that this reconstruction is conjectural, and argued with an equal degree of confidence that Caesar could not have possibly designated the *flamen* of his own divinity, but resorted to one of the many 'opportunists' that surrounded him.

Most recently, Stevenson 2015: 65–7 has stressed the significance of Caesar's election to this priestly office, and the need for him to obtain popular support against stiff competition, suggesting that there may have been a religious background to the process that escapes us. Caesar's belonging to one of the *familiae Troianae* may have played a part in that context. Tatum 2008: 35 suggests that Caesar chose to emphasise his Marian connection. The two scenarios are not incompatible and a firm conclusion is not at hand. Smith 2010 has a rich discussion of Caesar's keen interest in historical and antiquarian matters, which also extended to religious issues (see esp. 255–8 on Rabirius' trial), on which S. also stresses Caesar's expertise on archaic ritual. Smith's discussion of the work of L. Julius Caesar (260–4; cf. also the note by T. J. Cornell in *FRHist* A24) is also important. S. does not seem to attach much significance to the Caesar's exploitation of his priesthood on his civil war coinage and epigraphy: see Jehne 1987: 163–5, 172–3, and Pelling 2012: 159.

Caesar's reform of the calendar also receives little discussion in S.'s piece, but has attracted considerable scholarly interest over the last two decades. The reference discussion is J. Rüpke 1995: 380–7 (see also Rüpke 2011: 109–21), who argues that the reform was carried out by Caesar through his dictatorial powers (this view is accepted by Van Haepelen 2002: 216–23); Rüpke also offers a useful discussion of Caesar's approach to the problem of intercalation before the reform. Feeney 2007: 197, on the contrary, argues for a close connection between the reform and Caesar's pontifical status; the main focus of his discussion, however, is on the links between the reform of 46 and the wider developments on the reflection on time and chronology in the late Hellenistic period, in Rome and beyond (esp. 193–211). Schiesaro 2010 and Fantham 2011: 153–5 discuss the reform against the background of Caesar's wider intellectual interests and of his wider contribution to Roman cultural life.

The developments in the regulations on the election of priesthoods in the Roman Republican period have also received considerable attention. As S. notes, it is unclear whether the *lex Cornelia* of 81 had abolished the popular election of the *pontifex maximus*: this had long been taken for granted, until Strasburger 1938: 102 n. 30 and Taylor 1942c: 421–3 pointed out that there is in fact no evidence for that. Yet, the evidence of Cass. Dio 37.37.1–2 is compatible with the scenario of a complete abolition; Ridley 2005: 292 n. 77 takes a more cautious view. At any rate, the *lex Labiena* on priestly elections of 63 BC belongs in a trajectory that begins with the *lex Domitia* of 104 (on which cf. Drummond 2008 and North 2011), undoing the provisions of the *lex Cornelia* of 81. Strikingly, however, the circumstances and the debate that preceded the return to the principle of popular election under the *lex Labiena* are not attested in the literary evidence. As Drummond 1999: 150–1 shows, two chief problems are associated with this piece of legislation. First, there was probably no direct link between the election of Caesar and the reform of priestly recruitment, since

Sulla had not abolished the election of the *pontifex maximus* by the seventeen tribes. Secondly, the chronological sequence for the year is unclear: it is possible that the law was passed after Caesar's election to the praetorship for 62. Drummond's study is a robust challenge to the traditional view—which S. restates at the beginning of this paper—that the year 63 BC witnessed a concerted political and legislative initiative of the whole tribunician college and argues for a much more differentiated picture, in which Labienus plays a leading role. On the timing of Caesar's election see also Huber 1971: 1–31.

The evidence of Plutarch should now be read along with the commentary in Pelling 2012, which is especially informative (for the purposes of this discussion) on aspects of the election and on the calendar reform (158–60, 440–5). Drummond 1999: 151 is less confident about the accuracy of the chronology of Suetonius (who appears to place the pontifical election after the Rabirius trial(s)) than S. is; see also Pelling 2012: 159. For a possible further instance of Caesar's pontifical activity see Gell. 5.13.6, with Santangelo 2013b: 759.

Scheid 2005: 187–90 offers valuable remarks on the possibility to ensure the functioning of public religion without the direct involvement of the *pontifex maximus*—an option that, as S. notes, became especially relevant in the early Augustan period (cf. Ridley 2005 for a detailed analysis). S. does not discuss the importance of Caesar's decision to cumulate two senior priesthoods, the pontificate and the augurate, after the victory in the civil war (probably from 47: Cass. Dio 42.51.3–4, with Rüpke 2005: 1058–9)—a move that does anticipate imperial developments (Gordon 1990: 182–3). As Gordon notes, however, the remit of the powers and prerogatives of the *pontifex maximus* was not altered by Caesar, nor by Augustus. The central role of the *princeps* in the running of public religion was emphasised by the cumulation of key priestly offices within his control, not by the expansion of the prerogatives of a single priesthood. Stepper (1999: 172) stresses that the *pontifex maximus* was no *primus inter pares* and emphasises the intense competition that Caesar faced in 63 BC (173–74). Caesar's priesthood is consistently recorded in the epigraphical evidence from the Greek East (cf. Weinstock 1971: 31); however, the claim that this proves an attempt on Caesar's part to promote 'a charismatic reinterpretation' of the priesthood (183: 'charismatische[n] Umdeutung') is doubtful.

Augustus' reference to Lepidus' pontificate in RG 10.2 reads as follows (cf. n. 20): *eo mor[t]uo d[emum qui civilis tu]m[ultus] occasione occupaverat* (see Cooley 2009: 'once the man who had previously seized it in the civil disturbances had died').

In this essay S. holds the view that Sulla held the augurate when he struck RRC 359/1: this issue has been questioned with valid arguments in Frier 1967 and has given rise to a long debate, which is summarised in North 2011: 54 n. 59; see also 54–58 for a restatement of the sceptical case. Morgan 1997 has effectively brought out the counterintuitive complexity of *Sullam nescisse litteras* (cf. the addendum to no. 4); his discussion is also a valuable

discussion of Caesar's views on language, and both Morgan and S. resort to the notion of pedantry to make sense of Caesar's character. On Caesar's *De Analogia* see Garcea 2012; cf. 19–23 on Caesar's intellectual background and 41 n. 26 on the quote from Suet. *DJ* 77.

The evidence of Cass. Dio 44.4 for the hereditary nature of the highest pontificate is rejected by S. (cf. also *RP* 1.166, 366), but has found wide acceptance: see Taylor 1942c, 423–4; Weinstock 1971: 33–4; Ridley 2005: 292–3; Simpson 2007: 327–9.

21. CICERO'S CHANGE OF PLAN (AUGUST 7, 44 BC)

The decision that Cicero took at Leucopetra in August 44 BC had major consequences on the unfolding of the political history of the Triumviral period, as well as ultimately fatal implications for Cicero himself. The event has received wide attention in modern accounts of Cicero's biography, even well before S. Boissier 1905: 75, 82 offered memorable comments on the 'coup de vent' that stopped Cicero's journey to Greece; see also Stockton 1971: 292, Shackleton Bailey 1971: 244–5, van der Blom 2003: 300 and Tempest 2011: 188–9, who all accept the view that a tentative *rapprochement* between Antony and the Liberators was taking place in the summer of 44 and that Cicero acted in the hope that it would happen (more bibliography in Marinone 2004: 233). The same view is propounded by S. in this paper, as well as in *RR* (117–18, 139–40); see esp. 117 n. 4, where Madvig's choice to omit *Sextilibus* is also criticised, and the meeting at Rhgium is dated 'on or soon after August 6th', rather than on the 7th, as is the case in this essay.

The chronology of Cicero's movements in this period has been intensely debated. Ramsey 2003: 105 accepts Denniston's view (cf. n. 13 of the paper) that Cicero did not leave Leucopetra as swiftly as *Phil.* 1.9 suggests: it can hardly have taken him ten days to sail from there to Velia. Finding a suitable passage from Leucopetra may have taken him about a week. Cicero's delay may be explained with logistical difficulties, as argued by Ramsey, by uncertainty on the best course of action on Cicero's part, or by a combination of factors. Ramsey 2001 even offers a tentative detailed chronology of the events and argues that Cicero spent five days in Leucopetra (2–6 August; accepted by Osgood 2006: 41 and Manuwald 2007: 18 n. 50; Marinone 2004: 233 does not address this issue). He also argues against the view that a reconciliation between Antony and the Liberators was taking shape at that stage, and notes that the tribunician election for 43 was an instance of the ongoing disagreement between Octavian and Antony (265 n. 49). He places considerable weight on the widespread criticism that Cicero's departure had met among the Roman public opinion (*Att.* 16.7.1). His overall assessment of Cicero's

change of plan is exactly the opposite of S.'s: Cicero was not entertaining the hope of rallying a coalition of moderates against Antony, but was seeking common ground with Antony in order to oppose 'the more radical Caesarian stance of Octavian' (266).

Mitchell 1991: 301 takes a minimalistic view of Cicero's plans after Leucopetra: he returned to Rome because he realised that leaving Italy would not be honourable, but had no intention to regain a leading role in Roman politics. In his view, the meeting with Brutus on 17 August was crucial to Cicero's decision. Charlesworth's view that the news of the attack of Calpurnius Piso against Antony reached Cicero in Southern Italy is restated without discussion by Rawson 1994: 476. Gotter 1996: 128 makes the attractive suggestion that the memory of his hesitation in 49 BC was a crucial factor in persuading Cicero to rush back to Rome when he saw that there was a margin for action.

Ramsey 2001: 265 and Wardle 2014: 121 verge towards mid-July as the likely date of the tribunician election; if that is correct, Cassius Dio's evidence is to be preferred to Suetonius' on this point. On the chronological uncertainties about the reconciliation between Octavian and Antony see Mangiameli 2012: 54 n. 237.

Butler 2002: 112–13 makes thought-provoking reading on Cicero's correspondence with Atticus in the period preceding and following his 'change of plan' and on the links between the decision to return to Rome, his continuing literary production, and the justification for his conduct at the outset of *Phil.* 1.

22. NICOLAUS OF DAMASCUS XXVIII AND XXXI

There is no clear indication of the chronology of this paper. The likeliest guess is that it was written when S. was working on *RR*, which is not quoted in the footnotes; the latest piece of scholarship that is discussed is Motzo's 1933 paper (on which cf. also *RR* 131 n. 2). Nic. Dam. 31.133 receives a brief discussion in *RR* 131–2 n. 4, where the main points of the second part of this note are summarised: the possibility that Lucius may be Maecenas' father, the suggestion of L. Cornificius, and the significant absence of Salvidienus. 28.111 is discussed even more cursorily below (134), where S. notes in passing the absence of the consulars L. Marcius Philippus and C. Claudius Marcellus (on whom cf. Plut. *Cic.* 44.1) from Nicolaus' list (only Philippus is mentioned in the paper published here).

Canfora 2015: 5 (and *passim*) gives a similar assessment of Nicolaus' historiographical credentials to the view exposed by S. here. Toher 2009 makes a convincing case for a more positive assessment of the literary and historiographical agenda of this author and shows that his work is not to be read as a free paraphrase of Augustus' autobiography. Parmentier and Barone

2011: XXXIV argue that the biography of Augustus is influenced by the 'propaganda' of the *princeps*; Nicolaus' lost historical work in 144 books, however, was informed by a more ambitious and complex intellectual agenda (XXXV–XLVIII).

Parmentier and Barone 2011: 276 n. 118 envisage only two possible hypotheses for the identification of 'Lucius': either L. Julius Caesar or L. Calpurnius Piso. They also readily identify the Maecenas that is mentioned at ch. 31 with C. Maecenas (291 n. 139 [in fact 140]); the same suggestion was made by Bellemore 1984: 131.

Junia, the wife of P. Servilius Isauricus, is identified as the daughter of Decimus Silanus by three inscriptions, two from Kos (AE 1934, 84; W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos* (Oxford 1891) no. 206) and one from Mytilene (IG 12 Suppl. 60); Münzer's suggestion (RE X.1, 1110 no. 192) that identified her as a daughter of Decimus Junius Silanus (cos. 62 BC) and a half-sister of Brutus has been contested with persuasive arguments by Harders 2007, who identifies Iunia's father with Decimus Silanus, *monetalis* in 91 BC, probably a homonymous cousin of the consul of 62.

23. VIRGIL'S FIRST PATRON

The relationship between Virgil and Asinius Pollio is discussed at various junctions in *RR*: at 252–3 Pollio is identified as the poet's first patron, who acted to rescue Virgil's estate from the confiscations; their connection goes back to the days of Pollio's service in Cisalpine. During Pollio's absence in Macedon Virgil became closer to Maecenas and eventually came under his patronage (see also 460). At 252 n. 5 there is a brief reference to the traditions on Virgil's biography and the confiscation of his estate related by the scholiasts, which S. argues cannot be used for the purposes of historical reconstruction. The paper that is published here develops this point at greater length and analyses the textual evidence for it in greater detail; on the Fourth Eclogue see *RR* 218–19.

Osgood 2006: 113 takes a similar view of the value of the information on Virgil's life provided by the ancient scholiasts; ch. 3 as a whole (108–51) provides an excellent discussion of the Triumviral land confiscations and their political impact. Stok 2013 provides an excellent reassessment of the ancient tradition on the triumvirate *agris dividendis* consisting of Asinius Pollio, Cornelius Gallus, and Alfenus Varus. He strongly questions its historical value, and plausibly argues that it was developed by Donatus, and at any rate no sooner than the second century AD. Wilkinson 1966 remains a judicious and valuable discussion of the historical value of *Ecl.* 1 and 9. There has been widespread scepticism on the identification of Horace's *Alfenus vafer* with the jurist P. Alfenus Varus. For discussion and bibliography see Gowers 2012: 144–5;

Hassan 2014: 43–6 accepts the view that Alfenus Varus had lowly origins. Cf. Della Corte 1984: 93 and Gowers, *ibid.* on the meaning of *vafer* (to be understood as ‘shrewd’, also with reference to Alfenus’ legal expertise). Liebs 2013 offers a valuable overview of the literary evidence for Alfenus and discusses its historical implications against the backdrop of the rise of municipal elites in late Republican Italy.

On Asinius Pollio’s relationship with Virgil see the excellent overview in Pavan and Della Corte 1988, including a full bibliography. Zecchini 1982 remains the fullest introduction to this major figure; see also *FRHist* 1.430–45 (A. Drummond).

On the relationship between Virgil and Cornelius Gallus see Gagliardi 2003: 41 and 51 n. 110, who is inclined to accept the tradition that they were *condiscipuli* as historical and lists further bibliography.

For a discussion of the problem of the second edition of the *Georgics* and a different reconstruction to Bayet’s see Martin 1985, where a full bibliography is also provided, and Gagliardi 2003: 62 n. 4.

The reference edition of the *elogium* of Sempronius Tuditanus is now Kruschwitz 2002: 148–58, no. 10.

On the relationship between Horace and Maecenas see Du Quesnay 1984: 24–7, 202 where an analogy is briefly drawn between Maecenas and Pollio (24).

24. CAESAR AND AUGUSTUS IN VIRGIL

The view that Caesar found hardly any place in Virgil’s work receives some discussion in *RR* within a wider treatment of the representation of Pompey and Caesar in the Augustan literature: Caesar is almost not spoken of, whereas Pompey is cast as the champion of Republican freedom that was defeated by Caesar (317–18). The deep similarities between the power of Caesar and Augustus were too close to enable a close discussion or comparison. This paper is later than *RR*, which is quoted in several footnotes. As White 1988: 334 notes, this argument is frequently and authoritatively restated in S.’s oeuvre (see n. 3 for a selective list).

The role of Caesar in Virgil’s work has received considerable scholarly attention, especially of late, and must be understood against the wider background of the reception of Caesar in the Augustan period. White 1988 has directly tackled S.’s argument and considerably qualified it: the evidence for a deliberate dissociation of Augustus from Caesar is far less strong than envisaged by S., the passages of Virgil that S. had viewed as critical of Caesar are open to a more positive reading, and the extract from Horace does not draw as strongly a separation between Caesar and Augustus as envisaged by

S. The claim that Caesar is deliberately excluded from the concerns of Augustan poetry does not stand up to close scrutiny. Caesar's deification afforded the *princeps* the opportunity to reflect about his own power and about the terms of a future programme of divine honours for himself. White's insights have also been developed in Kienast 2001, who argues that, while pursuing a very different political strategy to his adoptive father, Augustus did not obliterate the legacy and model of Caesar: on the contrary, his *auctoritas* was largely predicated on his status as *diui filius*. Cf. also the recent attempt of Zecchini 2010 to chart the areas of continuity between Caesar and Augustus.

Ledentu 2012 has also offered a general reconsideration of Caesar's place in the whole of Augustan poetry, and has stressed that its presence is at the same time elusive and significant, and is strongly connotated under the rubric of ambiguity. The *sidus Iulium* plays of course an important role in this connection: see 150–1 on *Ecl.* 9.46–9; cf. also 151 on Aeneas' shield (*Aen.* 8.678–81) and 157 on the ending of *Georgics* 1 and its verbal and thematic links with the opening dedication of the poem (esp. the reference to *miseratus* at 1.41). *Aen.* 1.286–91 is the most puzzling passage, and Ledentu argues that Virgil is intentionally overlapping and blurring the two figures of Caesar and Octavian in this passage by reverberating upon Octavian the military achievement of Caesar upon which he could not possibly improve, while at the same time stressing his debt towards his adoptive father (160–1).

Ledentu 2012: 158–9 does not view 6.834–5 as a critical reference to Caesar, like S. does, but as an allusion to his clemency, and argues that the interpretation conveyed by the passage is favourable to Caesar. White 1988: 349–50 has on the contrary emphasised the similarities between Caesar and Pompey in this context (a view accepted by Mineo 2012: 172–3).

Guédon 2012: 97 views *Georg.* 2.170–2 as an implicit reference to the Indian diplomatic missions to Rome in 25 and 20 BC and proposes to read *Aen.* 6.789–800 against the background of contemporary Roman interest in North Africa, notably the campaign of Cornelius Balbus against the Garamantes in 19 BC (94–105).

Gale 2013: 278 n. 2 opens her discussion of Caesar in Virgil with a mention of S.'s assessment and regards it as 'overstated', while recognising that Augustus retained a degree of caution towards Caesar's political legacy. Her following analysis focuses on three texts in which Caesar is explicitly mentioned, and which all betray a critical engagement with him and his politics, while at the same time linking him indirectly with Augustus: *Eclogue* 5 (which S. explicitly avoids: cf. n. 2), the finale of *Georgics* 1, and Anchises' speech in *Aeneid* 6. By problematising Caesar and his politics Virgil takes the opportunity to reflect in radical and creative ways on power, politics, and their discontents.

25. HOW MANY FASCES?

This paper may be dated with a fair degree of accuracy. The programme of the sixth 'Triennial' Joint Meeting organised by the Joint Committee of the Greek and Roman Societies, which took place in Cambridge in August 1958, included a paper by S. under the title 'How Many Fasces? An Approach to the Roman Constitution' (see the notice in *EClás* 4 [1957] 372). There is little doubt that it was an oral version of the text published here. An interest in constitutional matters is also apparent in another paper, published in the same period: 'Imperator Caesar: A Study in Nomenclature', *Historia* 7 (1958), 172–88, esp. 177 (= *RP* 1.361–7, 366–7).

The definition of Augustus' *imperium* receives some discussion in *RR* 312–23, where the integration between legal arrangements and the role of *auctoritas* in the settlement promoted by the *princeps* is strongly advocated; see also 336–7 on the settlement of 23 BC. *Fasces* do not receive any discussion in that context.

In the 1950s, when S. turned to this topic, *imperium* was an intensely debated topic, not just in English-speaking scholarship: cf. e.g. Last 1947; Jones 1951 (= 1960: 7–14, which opens with a hint of implicit polemic towards Syme); Ehrenberg 1953; Béranger 1953 (the latter is quoted in S.'s minimal annotations on the typescript). Staveley 1956: 107–12 provides a valuable overview of the main issues under discussion at the time. S. joined the debate by focusing on an ostensibly empirical issue, which can have wider historical and conceptual implications.

The main innovative point of S.'s paper is the value he attaches to consular *insignia*: in his view, there is a demonstrable link between hierarchies of *imperium* and hierarchies of *fasces*. The same working assumption underlies the discussion of Staveley 1963 (where no reference is made to S.): its focus, though, is mostly on the Republican period, and the Augustan developments are discussed only in the final section (483–4). The emphasis is placed on extra-urban power; in spite of Cass. Dio 54.10.5, Staveley suggests that Augustus had 24 lictors after 23 BC (cf. Cass. Dio 57.4 on Domitian). The reasons that led S. not to pursue the publication of 'How many *fasces*?' remain elusive; at any rate, the risk of overlap with Staveley's discussion cannot have been a factor.

The implications of the argument of 'How many *fasces*?' are fully brought out in an important passage of *AA* 42–3, where S. points out that, through the twelve *fasces*, Augustus displayed 'at the seat of empire' the *proconsulare imperium* that derived from his control over the provinces and the army (cf. the critical reference to Jones 1951 in n. 58); the tribunician power was the other cornerstone of the new settlement. The view that plebs and army were the 'twin pillars' of Augustus's rule goes back to *RR* 523 (see Girardet 2000: 174–6). Syme's dissatisfaction with Mommsen's reading of Cass.

Dio 53.1.1 and his theory on the twenty-four *fascēs* is apparent, but not clearly spelled out, in AA 1 n. 1. The Augustan settlement has long been the subject of intense scholarly debate, which the recent 2014 bimillenary has revived even further: over the last decade at least three major edited collections have offered a reassessment of the period, placing special emphasis on political and constitutional issues: Hurlet and Mineo 2009; Rivière 2012; Ferrary and Scheid 2015. Cf. also the important overview in Dalla Rosa and Hurlet 2009.

At least four further aspects of S.'s discussion deserve to be singled out. The contention that the Triumvirs had twelve *fascēs* all the time, without alternation, was not made by other scholars before S.: it has recently been put forward by Vervaeke 2014: 32–3, 240–2. Secondly, the weight that S. placed on the arrangements of 28/27 and the number of the *fascēs* ties in well with the current trend towards regarding that year as a major moment in the resettlement of the *res publica* (although Rich 2012: 106–11 points out that there is no evidence that Augustus used the expression *res publica restituta*). The publication of the *aureus* dating to Octavian's sixth consulship (28 BC) and carrying the legend *Leges et iura p(opuli) R(omani) restituit* (Rich and Williams 1999; Mantovani 2008; Rich 2012: 89–105) has played a decisive role in spurring the debate: for recent discussions in that vein see Hurlet 2001 (esp. 164–9) and 2011 (esp. 324–6) and Dalla Rosa 2015 (esp. 558–60 on *insignia*). Thirdly, S. points out that Augustus should have used the title of proconsul after 23 BC, but chose not to do that (see also AA 42): the edicts from El Bierzo (15 BC: AE 2000, 760) now show that he in fact did so (Alföldy 2000: 194–5), assuming that their authenticity is to be accepted (Ferrary 2001: 116 = 2009: 99; Richardson 2002).

Lastly, S. makes a distinctive contribution on the nature of the consular power of Augustus in 19. The extent of scholarly debate and disagreement on this point is considerable (see the overview in Vervaeke 2014: 253–88). S.'s view (*contra* Jones 1951) is that Augustus did not obtain consular powers, but obtained the prerogative of using at Rome the same *insignia* that he displayed elsewhere as proconsul (cf. Ferrary 2001: 123; Cotton and Yakobson 2002: 196–202). That entailed an important corollary: he had the margin to perform some tasks that pertained to the power symbolised by those *insignia*. Ostensibly, therefore, his power was similar to that of the consuls, but was in fact deeply different from it: although he had *imperium*, Augustus was not a magistrate. This point has been stressed by Dalla Rosa 2003: 231–3, 241–6 and 2015, esp. 256–7; for a very different assessment cf. Vervaeke 2014: 265–75, who argues that the settlement of 19 BC was a return to the pre-23 BC state of affairs (cf. however his view that 19 BC is the moment that marked the final demise of the Republic). The significance of the prerogative to wear twelve *fascēs* that was granted to Augustus in 19 BC is rightly brought out by Ferrary 2001: 117, 121–5 (cf. 2009: 100, 103–4), in his ground-breaking discussion of

the powers of the *princeps* (available in an abridged English version: Ferrary 2009). It was a political and constitutional compromise, which gave the *princeps* the outward appearance of the consul without conferring upon him the same set of powers (see also Hurlet 2001: 170–2 and 2011: 328).

However, S.'s approach must be qualified in at least one important respect: the assumption that *imperium consulare* and *proconsulare* are two different entities. As Girardet 2000: 176–80 and Ferrary 2001: 109 (= 2009: 93) show, the expression *proconsulare imperium* is not attested before Tiberius, and drawing a distinction between *consulare* and *proconsulare imperium* for the Republican or Augustan period is anachronistic.

Marshall 1984 makes a well-argued case for the enduring symbolic significance of the *fasces* in Roman political culture: see esp. 131–2 on their number and the Augustan developments in that connection. Schäfer 1989: 206–17 offers a thorough discussion of the iconographic evidence for *fasces* and lictors; cf. 209–14 on the number of *fasces* of curule magistrates. Its emphasis is on the visual dimension of the problem.

Drogula 2015 has recently made a lengthy case for the view that *imperium* had an exclusively military connotation and was not used in the city of Rome: in his view, the notion of *imperium domi* is a contradiction in terms. At 93–7 the *fasces* receive close discussion. The assumption that *fasces* represent *imperium* is contested, in direct polemic with Staveley: their connection with *imperium* applies only when they are equipped with axes (which was prohibited within the *pomerium*; for an earlier version of this argument cf. Drogula 2007: 431–4). For an important treatment of the conceptual implications of the notion of *imperium*, and its relationship with Greek and modern conceptions of 'power', cf. Gotter 2008: 199–204.

The use of the word *ἐξάπλεκτος* in the Greek world is stressed at the outset of the discussion in *Greeks Invading the Roman Government* (Brooklyne, Mass. 1982) 10 (= *RP* 4.1–20, at 2), as an instance of the distinctive approach to Roman power and might in 'the Greek lands'. Cf. Drogula 2015: 94–5.

Vervaet 2014: 32–3 also stresses, like Syme, the importance of the evidence of Cass. Dio 53.1.1, but takes a different view on the meaning of *tais eterais*: instead of understanding it as the sticks carried by the lictors of the consul who did not hold the *fasces*, Vervaet views them as the other set of consular *fasces*. Octavian was therefore entitled to use his set of *fasces* 'whenever he was entitled to do so, viz. during the odd months'.

Rowe 2013 has put forward a revisionist reading of *RG* 34.3, whereby the emphasis of the passage is on a specific event and on Augustus' *auctoritas* as *princeps senatus*: this source should therefore be not used as evidence for the wider views of the emperor on the nature of his rule (cf. 15: 'even S. was not immune to the charms of *auctoritas*'). Galinsky 2015 is unconvinced, restates the case in favour of the traditional interpretation, and notes that this specific meaning of *auctoritas* finds no parallel whatsoever in the surviving evidence.

On the career of P. Cornelius Cethegus see Sumner 1973: 106. The brief tenure of the *praefectura urbi* by Messalla Corvinus and the argument he used to justify his resignation are discussed in Ruciński 2009: 48–52.

26. ROME AND UMBRIA

As pointed out in the Introduction, a full-scale discussion of a region of Roman Italy may come across as a somewhat surprising presence in S.'s posthumous papers. This draft is likely to date to the late 1950s, but S. came back to his interest in Spolegium and the link between Roman conquest and road-building in Umbria in 'Spolegium and the Via Flaminia', *DdA* 4–5 (1972) 422–30 (= *RP* 3.885–91). The paper is a local history of Spolegium in the Republican period, mainly focused on leading members of the local elite; it overlaps with various aspects of the essay presented here, esp. in the section on 'Political Partisans'. The argument on tribal affiliation and *clientela* is developed further by resorting to more examples (890–1), and S. records in greater detail his engagement with the *Pietas* inscription: he had an epistolary exchange with A. Degrassi about it in 1939 and saw it in 1948 (890). Remarkably, S. had reached the conclusion that the inscription refers to the consul of 39 BC before seeing the photograph of it that Degrassi sent him, which confirmed beyond doubt a late Republican dating (*RR* 221 n. 1).

S.'s opening comment on the lack of a history of Italy in the Roman period was already debatable at the time when it was written. It is certainly no longer valid now: a vast body of scholarship on ancient Italy before and after the advent of the Roman hegemony is available in the last five decades or so. A comprehensive summary would exceed the remit of this note. Two very different works that have appeared in English in the last decade give the measure of how much progress has been made: Bradley-Isayev-Riva 2007, which also provides a valuable bibliographical introduction, and *Imagines Italicae* (Crawford 2011), a corpus of Italic inscriptions that provides a full account of their archaeological context. The study of ancient Umbria and the impact of Roman conquest on the region has also changed beyond recognition in the last few decades because of the major contribution that new archaeological evidence has made. Harris 1971 remains an essential introduction to the coming of Rome and its implications; Sisani 2007 is, on the one hand, an account of the 'Romanisation' of Umbria and, on the other, a full critical inventory of the evidence for it, both textual and archaeological (cf. Crawford 2012). Bradley 2000 takes a longer-term view, encompassing the history of the region from the Iron Age to Augustus. On pre-Roman Umbria cf. Sisani 2009, Amann 2011, and the evidence gathered in the first volume of *Imagines Italicae*.

I. On Propertius and his connection with his hometown see the series of conference volumes edited by the Accademia Properziana at Assisi: cf. esp. Santini and Santucci 2004; Cristofoli, Santini, and Santucci 2012; Bonamente, Santini, and Cristofoli 2014. The possibility that Lucretius may have been of Umbrian (or Sabine) ancestry is also stated in *Sallust*, 7. Holland 1979 argues, largely on grounds of style and prosody, that he came from Transpadana; the claim is dubious. For historical discussions of the Iguvine Tables see Harris 1971: 185–92; Bradley 2000: 74, 77, 178–83; Amann 2011: 219–21, 280–2. On Iguvium and its urban development cf. Sisani 2001 and 2010.

The military conflicts between Rome and the Umbrians are discussed in Harris 1971: 49–78 and Sisani 2007: 32–47. Harris 1971: 64–5 defends the literary tradition on the Cilnii.

On the material culture of Tuder see Bradley 2000: 90–2 and Sisani 2007: 171–3; on the Mars of Todi see Bradley 2000: 71–2, 200–1, 252. Sisani 2007: 67–79 has a valuable discussion of the geography of ancient Umbria, with a strong focus on the boundaries between communities. On Silius Italicus' digression cf. the sceptical reading of Santini 1996.

II. The Sentinum campaign is summarised and discussed in Harris 1971: 69–74 (esp. 70 on Umbrian involvement); Bradley 2000: 115–16; Sisani 2007: 40–6 (cf. 46 on the triumph over the Sassinates); Amann 2011: 162–3.

Sisani 2007: 85–9 and Amann 2011: 196–7 discuss the foundation of Narnia. Harris 1971: 75 enlists some evidence for the involvement of Clusium in the military campaigns of the period. On the role of the Sabines in this context see Oakley 2005: 30–1.

The position of Oriculum is discussed by Sisani 2007: 59, 61, 58–9; on the involvement of Camerinum in the war see *ibid.*, 32–3, 35 (with a defence of the literary tradition).

The recently published material from the hypogaeum of the Cacni provides invaluable insight into the standing and self-representation strategies of a leading family of Perugia: Cifani 2015 and Benelli 2015.

III. On the treaty between Rome and Camerinum see Harris 1971: 98–9; Bradley 2000: 118–19; Sisani 2007: 113–15; Amann 2011: 166–8.

See Sisani 2007: 122–6 for a revisionist view of the itinerary of the via Flaminia, whereby the earliest branch is the eastern one, leading to Spolegium, rather than the western one. Cf. Amann 2011: 312–14.

On the location of the defeat of Centenius see Sisani 2007: 57–8, who identifies Appian's *Pleistine limne* with the Colfiorito marsh; cf. Amann 2011: 107.

IV. There are good accounts of the colonial foundation at Spolegium in Bradley 2000: 134–5 and Sisani 2007: 90–7.

On Interamna Nahars see Sisani 2007: 146–50 and 164–8 and Crawford 2012: 739.

The position of Spolegium is discussed in Bradley 2000: 236–7; cf. below under VI. Harris 1971: 195–6 draws attention to the importance of Matrinius.

On the position of the Umbrians in the Social War see Sisani 2007: 62–4, with the qualifications of Crawford 2012: 737.

Rohr Vio 2009: 91–4 and Bühler 2009: 99–109 summarise Ventidius' involvement in the Perusine War.

V. The *foedera* between Rome and several Umbrian communities have received sustained scholarly attention: see e.g. Bradley 2000: 107–12, 118–28; Sisani 2007: 100–15.

On the octovirate at Plestia see also Sensi 1990 (cf. 456 on the inscription that is mentioned in S.'s text); Bradley 2000: 140–4; Sisani 2007: 267–8; Bispham 2007: 376, 472. Curchin 2016: 43–45 does not view it as a municipal magistracy, and links it to the membership of a religious association. For an overview of pre-Roman institutions and magistracies in Umbria see Amann 2011: 260–80.

Sisani 2007: 205–25 gives an overview of tribal allocations. Harris 1971: 239–40 regards the inclusion of a number of Umbrian communities in the Clustumina as a punitive measure, against Taylor 1960: 112–15. Sisani 2007: 225 regards the choice of Clustumina as a symptom of 'tendenza all'uniformità'; cf. Crawford 2012: 741 on the difficulties entailed by this interpretation.

On *CIL* 11.5802 see Sisani 2007: 207–8, who cautiously attributes it to the territory of Iguvium.

On P. Cominius see Wiseman 1971: 36, who stresses that he was not a member of the senatorial order, and Sumner 1973: 146, who places his birth in 92 BC at the latest.

The *faeneratores* mentioned by Cato were almost certainly not from Camerinum, but from the town of Cameria or Camerium in Latium, since they had citizen status: Harris 1971: 99–100 n. 7, *contra* Nissen 1902: 388. The same view is expressed in Nicolet 1979: 294–5, who also offers some discussion of the context of Cato's statement, which was made in a speech on an elusive *lex* or *rogatio Iunia*, not in the *Origines*.

Feig Vishnia 2012 offers a general reconsideration of C. Flaminius and his policies, with a useful bibliographical overview. On Forum Flaminii cf. Sisani 2007: 130–1, 217–18; Bispham 2007: 472.

VI. On the Camertes that were disenfranchised by Marius see Harris 1971: 195–7, 294. On the consequences faced by Spoletium after the Civil War see Gabba 1970/1971 (= 1973: 361–7) and Santangelo 2007: 154; for a revisionist reading cf. Thein 2016. Against the etymological link between *Tuditonus* and *Tuder* cf. also *Some Arval Brethren* (Oxford 1980) 61. Crook and Cloud 1993 offer an excellent introduction to the *pro Vareno* and its political and legal background.

On the Triumviral colonies in Italy see the list in Keppie 1983: 63, which also tentatively includes Teanum (App. *BC* 5.19–20). The classic discussion of the *bellum Perusinum* is Gabba 1971; see also Gabba 1986 (= 1994: 203–10). On Tuder see Keppie 1983: 176–7. Bradley 2000: 234–9, 249–50 is very useful on the position of the Umbrian elites in the late Republic.

For a recent reconsideration of the prosopography of the Cocceii see Hillard and Beness 2015.

VII. Syme's account of the making of the new senatorial elite under Caesar has received a critical discussion in Bruhns 1978: 81–8. On the *pro Roscio Amerino* cf. the addendum to no. 5, above.

Wiseman 1971 (esp. 176–8) remains essential reading on new senatorial accessions in this period. See 219 no. 80 on L. Caepasius; on Calvisius Sabinus see 221, no. 96, where the thesis of his Spoletine origin is accepted—S. had stated it in the 1958 piece on 'Sabinus the muleteer' and in 'Senators, Tribes and Towns', *Historia* 13 (1964) 105–25 at 113–14 (RP 2.582–604, at 587). Syme's interest in *CIL* 11.4772 = *ILS* 925 dates back to the time when he was working on *RR*: as he recalled in his review of A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Latinae liberae rei publicae*, *JRS* 57 (1967), 262–3, at 263 (RP 2.638–41, at 641), in March 1939 Degrassi sent him a photograph of the inscription (cf. *RR*, ix).

On Calvisius' career see *PIR* 2.83–4, C no. 352. The praetorship of Calvisius was redated to 44 BC by Sumner 1971: 265–7, 365 on the basis of an emendation to *Phil.* 3.26; *contra* cf. Manuwald 2007: 419. On Staius Murcus Sumner notes (361) that he is assumed to have been praetor in 45 in light of his proconsulship in Syria the following year, but that there is 'remarkably little preparation' for that career progression.

Clark 2007: 204–5 discusses *pietas* among the watchwords and battle passwords that were used in the late Republican period; cf. 218–20 on Cicero's use of 'divine qualities' to define an "inclusive" community, however narrow; the distance from Syme's discussion of 'catchwords' in this period is self-evident. The letter of Messala to Teos and the role that *eusebeia/pietas* plays in it have recently been reconsidered by Driediger-Murphy 2014, who argues that the reference to the Romans' commitment to securing divine favour should read against the background of the competitive language that was typical of Hellenistic diplomacy, rather than as a claim to divine favour.

On Staius Murcus see Wiseman 1971: 263 no. 411. On Pollio see Wiseman 1971: 215 no. 50 and the bibliography listed under no. 23. On C. Furnius see Pelling 1988: 262–3.

On P. Ventidius Bassus' rise to the Senate see Rohr Vio 2009: 39–43 and Bühler 2009: 63–5.

Tansey 2007 questions Syme's view that Messalla Corvinus was an associate of Antony during his involvement in the *bellum Siculum* (see *RR* 237) and argues that he 'parted company' with Antony as early as 39 BC.

On the date when the consuls of 39 BC were designated cf. App. *BC* 4.2 and Cass. Dio 47.19.4, both discussing the formation of the Triumvirate in 43 BC.

Farney 2007: 90–101, 215 notes the frequency of the *cognomen* Sabinus in the senatorial order during the late Republican and Augustan periods, and points out that some families falsified a Sabine heritage in order to assert frugality and impeccable moral credentials.

The dossier on Sabinus the muleteer has received a fresh reconsideration in Shaw 2007, who builds on S.'s prosopographical conclusions and uses *Catalepton* 10 as valuable evidence for the study of 'entrepreneurial' men in late Republican and early Imperial Italy. Cf. also Farney 2007: 92–4, esp. n. 42.

On. C. Calvisius Sabinus (*cos.* 4 BC) see *PIR* 2.84–5, C 353; on the homonymous consul of AD 26 see C 354. Vassileiou 1974 identifies the Calvisius Sabinus ridiculed by Seneca as the latter; see also Mratschek-Halfmann 1993: 288. On [P.? Calv?]isius Sabinus Pomponius Secundus see the entries in Salomies 1992: 114; *PIR* 6.331–3, P 754; Tortoriello 2004: 484. Kavanagh 2009 discusses the position of the Calvisii Sabini in the history of Spoletium in the Julio-Claudian period and their relationship with another local family, the Suillii Rufi; cf. esp. 88–9 on *CIL* 11.4772. See also Augier 2014: 49. Syme discussed the evidence for another Calvisius of consular rank in 'P. Calvisius Ruso, One Person or Two?', *ZPE* 56 (1984) 173–92 (= *RP* 4.397–417), arguing that he was consul c. 84 and that he should not be confused with P. Calvisius Ruso *cos.* 79.

Bibliography

- Alexander, M. C. (1990) *Trials in the Roman Republic, 146 BC to 50 BC*. Toronto, Buffalo and London.
- Alföldi, A. (1975) Review of Weinstock 1971, *Gnomon* 47: 154–79.
- Alföldy, G. (2000) ‘Das neue Edikt des Augustus aus El Bierzo in Hispanien’, *ZPE* 131: 177–205.
- Amann, P. (2011) *Die antiken Umbre zwischen Tiber und Apennin unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Einflüsse aus Etrurien*. Vienna.
- Angeli Bertinelli, M. G. et al. (1997) *Plutarco. Le Vite di Lisandro e di Silla*. Milan.
- Astin, A. E. (1967) *Scipio Aemilianus*. Oxford.
- Augier, B. (2014) ‘Implantation foncière et influence locale dans le Bellum Civile: le cas des nouveaux sénateurs’, in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, 30 anni dopo*, eds. M. L. Caldelli and G. L. Gregori, Rome: 39–56.
- Austin, R. G. (1960) *M. Tulli Ciceronis pro M. Caelio oratio*. Oxford, 3rd ed.
- Badian, E. (1955) ‘The Date of Pompey’s First Triumph’, *Hermes* 83: 107–18.
- Badian, E. (1958) *Foreign Clientelae (264–70 B.C.)*. Oxford.
- Badian, E. (1962a) ‘Forschungsbericht: From the Gracchi to Sulla’, *Historia* 11: 197–245.
- Badian, E. (1962b) ‘Waiting for Sulla’, *JRS* 52: 47–62.
- Badian, E. (1964) *Studies in Greek and Roman History*. Oxford.
- Badian, E. (1984) ‘The House of the Servilii Gemini. A Study in the Misuse of Occam’s Razor’, *PBSR* 52: 49–71.
- Badian, E. (1988) ‘The Clever and the Wise. Two Roman *cognomina* in Context’, in *Vir bonus discendi peritus. Studies in Celebration of Otto Skutsch’s Eightieth Birthday*, ed. N. Horsfall. London: 6–12.
- Badian, E. (1990) ‘The Consuls, 179–49 BC’, *Chiron* 20: 371–413.
- Balsdon, J. V. D. (1951) ‘Sulla Felix’, *JRS* 41: 1–10.
- Barbu, N. I. (1933) *Les Sources et l’originalité d’Appien dans le deuxième livre des Guerres Civiles*. Paris.
- Bellemore, J. (ed.) (1984) *Nicolaus of Damascus. Life of Augustus*. Bristol.
- Benelli, E. (2015) ‘I Cacni, famiglia perugina’, *RM* 121: 177–98.
- Béranger, J. (1953) *Recherches sur l’aspect idéologique du principat* (Basle).
- Berry, D. H. (1996) *Cicero. Pro Sulla Oratio*. Cambridge.
- Bispham, E. (2007) *From Asculum to Actium. The Municipalization of Italy from the Social War to Augustus*. Oxford.
- Blom, H. van der (2003) ‘*Officium* and *res publica*: Cicero’s Political Role after the Ides of March’, *C&M* 54: 287–320.
- Boissier, G. (1905) *Cicéron et ses amis. Étude sur la société romaine du temps de César*. Paris, 13th ed.
- Bonamente, G., Santini, C., and Cristofoli, R. (eds.) (2014) *Properzio e l’età augustea. Cultura, storia, arte*. Turnhout.
- Boyd, B. W. (1987) ‘*Virtus effeminata* and Sallust’s Sempronius’, *TAPA* 117: 183–201.
- Bradley, G. J. (2000) *Ancient Umbria. State, Culture, and Identity in Central Italy from the Iron Age to the Augustan Era*. Oxford.

- Bradley, G. J., Isayev, E., and Riva, C. (eds.) (2007) *Ancient Italy. Regions without Boundaries*. Exeter.
- Brennan, T. C. (2000) *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*. Oxford.
- Briscoe, J. (1964) 'Q. Marcius Philippus and *Nova Sapientia*', *JRS* 54: 66–77.
- Briscoe, J. (2012) *A Commentary on Livy. Books 41–45*. Oxford.
- Bruhns, H. (1978) *Caesar und die römische Oberschicht in den Jahren 49–44 v. Chr. Untersuchungen zur Herrschaftsetablierung im Bürgerkrieg*. Göttingen.
- Brunt, P. A. (1980) 'On Historical Fragments and Epitomes', *CQ* 30: 477–94.
- Brunt, P. A. (1988) *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford.
- Bühler, D. (2009) *Macht und Treue. Publius Ventidius Bassus. Eine römische Karriere zwischen Republik und Monarchie*. Munich.
- Burton, P. (2014) 'The Revolt of Lepidus (cos. 78 BC) Reconsidered', *Historia* 63: 404–21.
- Butler, S. (2002) *The Hand of Cicero*. London and New York.
- Cadoux, T. J. (1980) 'Sallust and Sempronia', in *Vindex Humanitatis. Essays in Honour of John Huntly Bishop*, ed. B. Marshall. Armidale: 93–122.
- Cadoux, T. J. (2005) 'Catiline and the Vestal Virgins', *Historia* 54: 162–79.
- Camodeca, G. (2014) 'I senatori dell'Italia meridionale fra tarda Repubblica e III secolo. Un aggiornamento', in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, 30 anni dopo*, eds. M. L. Caldelli and G. L. Gregori. Rome: 1.253–75.
- Canfora, L. (1993) *Studi di storia della storiografia romana*. Bari.
- Canfora, L. (1999) *Giulio Cesare. Il dittatore democratico*. Bari and Rome.
- Canfora, L. (2014) 'La "carriera" religiosa" di Cesare', in *Sacerdos. Figure del sacro nella società romana*, ed. G. Urso. Pisa: 167–76.
- Canfora, L. (2015) *Augusto. Figlio di Dio*. Rome and Bari.
- Carney, T. F. (1970) *A Biography of C. Marius*, 2nd ed. Chicago.
- Carsana, C. (2007) *Commento storico al libro II delle Guerre Civili di Appiano (parte I)*, Pisa.
- Càssola, F. (1962) *I gruppi politici romani nel III secolo a. C.* Trieste.
- Ciaceri, E. (1929/1930) 'La dama Sempronia nella congiura di Catilina', *AAAN* 11: 219–30.
- Cichorius, C. (1922) *Römische Studien*. Leipzig and Berlin.
- Cifani, G. (2015) 'Il sepolcro dei *Cacni* a Perugia. Ideologia e cultura di una famiglia aristocratica tra ellenismo e romanizzazione', *RM* 121: 125–76.
- Clark, A. J. (2007) *Divine Qualities. Cult and Community in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- Clinton, K. (2001) 'Initiates in the Samothracian Mysteries, September 4, 100 B.C.', *Chiron* 31: 27–35.
- Coarelli, F. (1998) 'Lépide et Alba Fucens', *REA* 100: 461–75.
- Cooley, A. (2009) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Cotton, H. M. and Yakobson, A. (2002) 'Arcanum Imperii: The Powers of Augustus', in *Philosophy and Power in the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Miriam Griffin*, eds. G. Clark and T. Rajak. Oxford: 193–209.
- Crawford, J. W. (1984) *M. Tullius Cicero: The Lost and Unpublished Orations*. Göttingen.
- Crawford, M. H. (1968) 'The Edict of M. Marius Gratidianus', *PCPhS* 14: 1–4.

- Crawford, M. H. (1985) *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic. Italy and the Mediterranean Economy*. London.
- Crawford, M. H. (1992) *The Roman Republic*, 2nd ed. London.
- Crawford, M. H. (ed.) (2011) *Imagines Italicae. A Corpus of Italic Inscriptions*. London.
- Crawford, M. H. (2012) Review of Sisani 2007, *Athenaeum* 100: 737–42.
- Criniti, N. (1970) *L'epigrafe di Asculum di Gn. Pompeo Strabone*. Milan.
- Cristofoli, R. (2008) *Antonio e Cesare: anni 54–44 a.C.* Rome.
- Cristofoli, R., Santini, C., and Santucci, F. (eds.) (2012) *Properzio fra tradizione e innovazione*. Assisi.
- Crook, J. A. and Cloud, J. D. (1993) 'Cicero, *Pro Vareno*: An Exposition and a Riposte', in Jocelyn and Hurt: 169–80.
- Curchin, L. (2016) 'The Octovirate and Decemvirate in Italian Municipal Politics', *Latomus* 75: 27–54.
- Dalla Rosa, A. (2003) '*Ductu auspicioque*. Per una riflessione sui fondamenti religiosi del potere magistratuale fino all'età augustea', *SCO* 49: 185–255.
- Dalla Rosa, A. (2015) 'L'autocrate e il magistrato. Le attività di Augusto negli ambiti di competenza consolare', in *Il princeps romano: autocrate o magistrato? Fattori giuridici e fattori sociali del potere imperiale da Augusto a Commodo*, eds. J.-L. Ferrary and J. Scheid. Pavia: 555–85.
- Dalla Rosa, A. and Hurlet, F. (2009) 'Un quindicennio di ricerche su Augusto. Un bilancio storiografico', *SCO* 55: 169–231.
- David, J.-M. (1992) *Le Patronat judiciaire au dernier siècle de la République romaine*. Rome.
- Della Corte, F. (1984) 'Alfeno Varo', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, I. Rome: 92–3.
- Dettenhofer, M. H. (1992) *Perdita iuventus. Zwischen den Generationen von Caesar bis Augustus*. Munich.
- Devillers, O. and Sion-Jenkis, K. (eds.) (2012) *César sous Auguste*. Bordeaux.
- Dixon, S. (1992) *The Roman Family*. Baltimore and London.
- Dmitriev, S. (2011) *The Greek Slogan of Freedom and Early Roman Politics in Greece*. Oxford.
- Driediger-Murphy, L. G. (2014) 'M. Valerius Messala to Teos (Syll.³ 601) and the Theology of Rome's War against Antiochus III', *ZPE* 189: 115–20.
- Drogula, F. K. (2007) '*Imperium, potestas*, and the *pomerium* in the Roman Republic', *Historia* 56: 419–52.
- Drogula, F. K. (2015) *Commanders and Command in the Roman Republic and Early Empire*. Chapel Hill.
- Drummond, A. (1999) 'Tribunes and Tribunician Programmes in 63 B.C.', *Athenaeum* 87: 121–67.
- Drummond, A. (2008) 'The Ban on Gentiles Holding the Same Priesthood and Sulla's Augurate', *Historia* 57: 367–407.
- Du Quesnay, I. M. Le M. (1984) 'Horace and Maecenas. The Propaganda Value of *Sermones* I', in *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, eds. T. Woodman and D. West. Cambridge: 19–58, 200–11.
- Duval, G. M. (1991) 'D. Junius Brutus: mari ou fils de Sempronia?', *Latomus* 50: 608–15.
- Dyck, A. R. (2004) *A Commentary on Cicero, De Legibus*. Ann Arbor.
- Dyck, A. R. (2010) *Cicero. Pro Sexto Roscio*. Cambridge.

- Dyck, A. R. (2012) *Marcus Tullius Cicero. Speeches on Behalf of Marcus Fonteius and Marcus Aemilius Scaurus*. Oxford.
- Dyck, A. R. (2013) *Cicero. Pro Marco Caelio*. Cambridge.
- Ehrenberg, V. (1953) 'Imperium Maius in the Roman Republic', *AJP* 74: 113–36.
- Evans, R. J. (1987) 'Catiline's Wife', *AClass* 30: 69–72.
- Fantham, E. (2011) *Roman Readings. Roman Response to Greek Literature from Plautus to Statius and Quintilian*. Berlin and New York.
- Fantham, E. (2013) *Cicero's Pro Murena oratio*. Oxford.
- Farney, G. D. (2007) *Ethnic Competition and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*. Cambridge.
- Feeney, D. C. (2007) *Caesar's Calendar. The Ancient Calendar and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- Feig Vishnia, R. (2012) 'A Case of "Bad Press"? Gaius Flaminius in Ancient Historiography', *ZPE* 181: 27–45.
- Ferrary, J.-L. (1988) *Philhellénisme et Impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la Seconde Guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*. Rome.
- Ferrary, J.-L. (2001) 'À propos des pouvoirs d'Auguste', *CCGG* 12: 101–54.
- Ferrary, J.-L. (2009) 'The Powers of Augustus', in *Augustus*, ed. J. Edmondson. Edinburgh: 99–125.
- Ferrary, J.-L. and Scheid, J. (eds.) (2015) *Il princeps romano: autocrate o magistrato? Fattori giuridici e fattori sociali del potere imperiale da Augusto a Commodo*. Pavia.
- Flower, H. I. (2010) *Roman Republics*. Princeton.
- Frier, B. W. (1967) 'Augural Symbolism in Sulla's Invasion of 83', *Museum Notes (American Numismatic Society)* 13: 111–18.
- Fryde, E. B. (1983) *Humanism and Renaissance Historiography*. London.
- Gabba, E. (1958) *Appiano e la storia delle guerre civili*. Florence.
- Gabba, E. (1970/1971) 'Commento a Floro, II 9, 27–28', *SCO* 19–20: 461–4.
- Gabba, E. (1971) 'The Perusine War and Triumviral Italy', *HSCP* 75: 139–60.
- Gabba, E. (1973) *Esercito e società nella tarda Repubblica romana*. Florence.
- Gabba, E. (1986) 'Trasformazioni politiche e socio-economiche dell'Umbria dopo il "Bellum Perusinum"', in *Bimillenario della morte di Properzio*, eds. G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci. Assisi: 95–104.
- Gabba, E. (1994) *Italia romana*. Como.
- Gagliardi, P. (2003) *Gravis cantantibus umbra. Studi su Virgilio e Cornelio Gallo*. Bologna.
- Gale, M. R. (2013) 'Virgil's Caesar. Intertextuality and Ideology', in *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*, eds. J. Farrell and D. P. Nelis. Oxford: 278–96.
- Galinsky, K. (2015) 'Augustus' *Auctoritas* and *Res Gestae* 34.3', *Hermes* 143: 244–9.
- Garcea, A. (2012) *Caesar's De Analogia*. Oxford.
- Gelzer, M. (1950) Review of Scullard 1951, *Historia* 1: 634–42.
- Gelzer, M. (1962) *Kleine Schriften*, I. Wiesbaden.
- Giardina, A. (2010) 'Cesare vs Silla', in *Cesare: precursore o visionario?*, ed. G. Urso. Pisa: 31–45.
- Girardet, K. M. (2000) 'Imperium "maius". Politische und verfassungsrechtliche Aspekte. Versuch einer Klärung', in *La Révolution romaine après Ronald Syme. Bilans et perspectives*, ed. A. Giovannini. Vandoeuvres and Geneva: 167–227.

- Gisborne, M. (2005) 'A Curia of Kings. Sulla and Royal Imagery', in *Imaginary Kings: Royal Images in the Ancient Near East, Greece and Rome*, eds. R. Fowler and O. Hekster. Stuttgart: 105–23.
- González Román, C. (2006) 'Prosopografía del *Bellum Hispaniense*', in *Julio César y Corduba: tiempo y espacio en la campaña de Munda (49–45 a.C.)*, eds. E. Melchor Gil et al. Cordoba: 281–309.
- Goodyear, F. R. D. (1982) 'Sallust', in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, II, eds. E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen. Cambridge: 268–80.
- Gordon, R. (1990) 'From Republic to Principate: Priesthood, Religion and Ideology', in *Pagan Priests. Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, eds. M. Beard and J. North. London: 179–98.
- Gotter, U. (1996) *Der Diktator ist tot! Politik im Rom zwischen den Iden des März und der Begründung des Zweiten Triumvirats*. Stuttgart.
- Gotter, U. (2008) 'Cultural Differences and Cross-Cultural Contact. Greek and Roman Concepts of Power', *HSCP* 104: 179–230.
- Gowers, E. (2012) *Horace. Satires Book 1*. Cambridge.
- Gozalbes Cravioto, E. (2010) 'Los orígenes del reino de Mauretania (Marruecos)', *Polis* 22: 199–214.
- Gruen, E. S. (1966) 'The Dolabellae and Sulla', *AJP* 87: 385–99.
- Gruen, E. S. (1968) 'Pompey and the Pisones', *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 1: 155–70.
- Gruen, E. S. (1969a) 'Notes on the "First Catilinarian Conspiracy"', *CP* 64: 20–4.
- Gruen, E. S. (1971) 'Some Criminal Trials of the Late Roman Republic: Political and Prosopographical Problems', *Athenaeum* 49: 54–69.
- Gruen, E. S. (1974) *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- Gruen, E. S. (1984) *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- Guéron, S. (2012) 'Sur les pas de César en Afrique? La question de son influence sur l'exploration des confins africains sous Auguste', in Devillers and Sion-Jenkis: 93–105.
- Harders, A.-C. (2007) 'Die Identität der Iunia, Δέκμου θυγάτηρ und Ehefrau des P. Servilius Isauricus (cos. 48): Überlegungen zu BMusImp 3 : 3, 1, PH 206 und IG XII Suppl. 60', *Klio* 89: 403–16.
- Harris, W. V. (1971) *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*. Oxford.
- Hassan, R. (2014) *La poesia e il diritto in Orazio. Tra autore e pubblico*. Naples.
- Heftner, H. (1995) *Plutarch und der Aufstieg des Pompeius. Ein historischer Kommentar zu Plutarchs Pompeiusvita, I: Kap. 1–45*. Frankfurt.
- Hemelrijk, E. A. (1999) *Matrona Docta. Educated Women in the Roman élite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*. London and New York.
- Hillard, T. W. and Beness J. L. (2015) 'The Ancestry of Nerva', *CQ* 65: 756–65.
- Hinard, F. (1975) 'Le "Pro Quinctio", un discours politique?', *REA* 77: 88–107.
- Hinard, F. (1979) 'L. Cornelius Chrysogonus et la portée politique du *pro Roscio Amerino*', *LCM* 4: 75–6.
- Hinard, F. (1985) *Les Proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*. Rome.

- Hinard, F. (2006) *Cicéron. Pour Sextus Roscius*. Paris.
- Hinard, F. (2008) *Sullana varia. Aux sources de la première guerre civile romaine. De l'archéologie à l'histoire*. Paris.
- Hinard, F. (2011) *Rome, la dernière République. Recueil d'articles*. Bordeaux.
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J. (2010) *Reconstructing the Roman Republic. An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research*. Princeton.
- Holford-Strevens, L. (2003) *Aulus Gellius. An Antonine Scholar and His Achievement*. Oxford.
- Holland, L. A. (1979) *Lucretius and the Transpadanes*. Princeton.
- Hollander, D. B. (2007) *Money in the Late Roman Republic*. Leiden and Boston.
- Huber, G. (1971) *Untersuchungen zu Caesars Oberpontifikat*. Tübingen.
- Hurlet, F. (2001) 'Les Auspices d'Octavien/Auguste', *CCGG* 12: 155–80.
- Hurlet, F. (2011) 'Consulship and Consuls under Augustus', in 'Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic', eds. H. Beck et al. Cambridge: 319–35.
- Hurlet, F. (2012) 'Démocratie à Rome? Quelle démocratie? En relisant Millar (et Hölkeskamp)', in *Rome, a City and its Empire in Perspective: The Impact of the Roman World through Fergus Millar's Research. Rome, une cité impériale en jeu: l'impact du monde romain selon Fergus Millar*, ed. S. Benoist. Leiden and Boston: 19–43.
- Hurlet, F. and Mineo, B. (2009) (eds.) *Le Principat d'Auguste. Réalités et représentations du pouvoir. Autour de la Res publica restituta*. Rennes.
- Janell, G. (1920) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, ed. maior. Leipzig, Teubner.
- Jehne, M. (1987) *Der Staat des Dictators Caesar*. Cologne and Vienna.
- Jocelyn, H. and Hurt, H. (eds.) (1993) *Tria Lustra. Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent*. Liverpool.
- Jones, A. H. M. (1951) 'The imperium of Augustus', *JRS* 41: 112–19.
- Jones, A. H. M. (1960) *Studies in Roman Government and Law*. Oxford.
- Kaster, R. A. (2006) *Cicero. Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius*. Oxford.
- Kavanagh, B. (2009) 'Senators and Senatorial Politics in Julio-Claudian Spoleto', *Epigraphica* 71: 85–106.
- Kay, P. (2014) *Rome's Economic Revolution*. Oxford.
- Keaveney, A. (1984) 'Who Were the Sullani?', *Klio* 66: 114–50.
- Keaveney, A. (2003) 'The Short Career of Q. Lucretius Afella', *Eranos* 101: 84–93.
- Keaveney, A. (2005) *Sulla. The Last Republican*. London.
- Keppie, L. (1983) *Colonisation and Veteran Settlement in Italy. 47-14 B.C.* London.
- Kienast, D. (2001) 'Augustus und Caesar', *Chiron* 31: 1–26.
- Konrad, C. F. (1989) 'Cotta off Mellaria and the Identities of Fufidius', *CP* 84: 119–29.
- Konrad, C. F. (1994) *Plutarch's Sertorius. A Historical Commentary*. Chapel Hill.
- Krostenko, B. A. (2001) *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance*. Chicago.
- Kruschwitz, P. (2002) *Carmina Saturnia Epigraphica*. Stuttgart.
- La Penna, A. and Funari, R. (eds.) (2015) *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiae. I: Fragmenta 1.1–146*. Berlin and New York.
- Labruna, L. (1975) *Il console sovversivo: Marco Emilio Lepido e la sua rivolta*. Naples.
- Laffi, U. (1967) 'Il mito di Silla', *Athenaeum* 45: 177–213, 255–77.
- Last, H. (1947) 'Imperium maius. A Note', *JRS* 37: 157–64.

- Ledentu, M. (2012) 'Le(s) César(s) des poètes et la mémoire de la *res publica*', in Devillers and Sion-Jenkis: 147–62.
- Levick, B. (2015) *Catiline*. London.
- Lewis, R. G. (2001) 'Catiline and the Vestal', *CQ* 51: 141–9.
- Lewis, R. G. (2006) *Asconius. Commentaries on Speeches by Cicero*. Oxford.
- Licordari, A. (1982) 'Ascesa al Senato e rapporti con i territori d'origine. Italia, regio I (*Latium*)', in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio* 2, Rome: 9–57.
- Liebs, D. (2013) 'Eine Karriere in Zeiten des Umbruchs', in *Art, Intellect and Politics. A Diachronic Perspective*, eds. G. M. A. Margagliotta and A. A. Robiglio. Leiden and Boston: 311–36.
- Linderski, J. (1963) 'Cicero and Sallust on Vargunteius', *Historia* 12: 511–12.
- Linderski, J. (1995) *Roman Questions. Selected Papers*. Stuttgart.
- Lindsay, H. (2009) *Adoption in the Roman World*. Cambridge.
- Lintott, A. (2008) *Cicero as Evidence. A Historian's Companion*. Oxford.
- Lo Cascio, E. (1979) 'Carbone, Druso e Gratidiano: la gestione della *res nummaria* a Roma tra la *lex Papiria* e la *lex Cornelia*', *Athenaeum* 57: 215–38.
- Lovano, M. (2002) *The Age of Cinna: Crucible of Late Republican Rome*. Stuttgart.
- Mackail, J. W. (1930) *The Aeneid of Virgil*. Oxford.
- Madjoub, M. (2006) 'Note sur quelques rois du Maroc antique', in *L'Africa romana XVI, Rabat 2004*. Rome: 259–68.
- Mangiameli, R. (2012) *Tra duces e milites. Forme di comunicazione politica al tramonto della Repubblica*. Trieste.
- Mantovani, D. (2008) 'Leges et iura p(opuli) R(omani) restituit. Principe e diritto in un aureo di Ottaviano', *Athenaeum* 96: 5–58.
- Manuwald, G. (2007) *Cicero. Philippics 3–9. Volume 2: Commentary*. Berlin and New York.
- Marinone, N. (2004) *Cronologia ciceroniana*, 2nd ed. Rome and Bologna.
- Marshall, A. J. (1984) 'Symbols and Showmanship in Roman Public Life: the *fascēs*', *Phoenix* 38: 120–41.
- Marshall, B. A. (1976) *Crassus. A Political Biography*. Amsterdam.
- Marshall, B. A. (1977) 'The Date of Catiline's Marriage to Aurelia Orestilla', *RFIC* 105: 151–4.
- Marshall, B. A. (1985a) *A Historical Commentary on Asconius*. Columbia.
- Marshall, B. A. (1985b) 'Catilina and the Execution of M. Marius Gratidianus', *CQ* 35: 124–33.
- Marshall, B. A. and Baker, R. J. (1975) 'The Aspirations of Q. Arrius', *Historia* 24: 220–31.
- Martin, R. (1985) 'Georgiche. 2. La datazione e la pubblicazione', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* II. Rome: 664–9.
- Märtin, S. (2012) *Die politische Führungsschicht der römischen Republik im 2. Jh. v. Chr. zwischen Konformitätsstreben und struktureller Differenzierung*. Trier.
- Massa, G. (2006) 'Sallustio contro Cicerone? I falsi d'autore e la polemica anticiceroniana di Asinio Pollione', *Athenaeum* 94: 415–66.
- Mathieu, N. (1999) *Histoire d'un nom: les Aufidii, dans la vie politique, économique et sociale du monde romain, II^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ—III^e siècle après Jésus-Christ*. Rennes.

- McDermott, W. C. (1969) 'De Luceiis', *Hermes* 97: 233–46.
- McGushin, P. (1977) *C. Sallustius Crispus. Bellum Catilinae. A Commentary*. Leiden.
- McGushin, P. (1992) *Sallust. The Histories. Volume I. Books i–ii*. Oxford.
- McGushin, P. (1994) *Sallust. The Histories. Volume II. Books iii–v*. Oxford.
- Milnor, K. (2009) 'Women in Roman Historiography', in *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historiography*, ed. A. Feldherr. Cambridge: 276–87.
- Mineo, B. (2012) 'Le César de Tite-Live était-il politiquement incorrect?', in Devillers and Sion-Jenkis: 163–75.
- Mitchell, T. N. (1979) *Cicero. The Ascending Years*. New Haven and London.
- Mitchell, T. N. (1991) *Cicero. The Senior Statesman*. New Haven and London.
- Moreau, P. (1982) *Clodiana religio. Un procès politique en 61 av. J.-C.* Paris.
- Morgan, L. (1997) 'Levi quidem de re...: Julius Caesar as Tyrant and Pedant', *JRS* 87: 23–40.
- Mratschek-Halfmann, S. (1993) *Divites et Praepotentes: Reichtum und soziale Stellung in der Literatur der Prinzipatszeit*. Stuttgart.
- Nicholson, J. (1997) 'Goats and Gout in Catullus 71', *CW* 90: 251–61.
- Nicolet, C. (1966) *L'Ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine (312–43 av. J.-C.). Tome 1. Définitions juridiques et structures sociales*. Paris.
- Nicolet, C. (1967) 'Arpinum, Aemilius Scaurus et les Tullii Cicerones', *REL* 45: 276–304.
- Nicolet, C. (1974) *L'Ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine (312–43 av. J.-C.). Tome 2. Prosopographie des chevaliers Romains*. Paris.
- Nicolet, C. (1979) 'Varron et la politique de Caius Gracchus', *Historia* 28: 276–300.
- Nissen, H. (1902) *Italische Landeskunde*, II. Berlin.
- Noonan, J. D. (1979) 'Mala bestia in Catullus 69.7–8', *CW* 73: 155–64.
- North, J. (2011) 'Lex Domitia Revisited', in *Priests and State in the Roman World*, eds. J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo. Stuttgart: 39–61.
- Novokhatko, A. A. (2009) *The Invectives of Sallust and Cicero: Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Berlin and New York.
- Oakley, S. P. (2005) *A Commentary on Livy. Books VI–X. Volume IV: Book X*. Oxford.
- Osgood, J. (2006) *Caesar's Legacy. Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire*. Cambridge.
- Pagán, V. E. (2009) *Conspiracy Narratives in Roman History*. Austin.
- Panciera, S. (1981) 'Aquileiesi in Occidente ed Occidentali in Aquileia', *Antichità altoadriatiche* 10: 105–38 (= 2006: 1.803–23).
- Panciera, S. (2006) *Epigrafi, epigrafia, epigrafisti. Scritti vari editi e inediti (1956–2005) con note complementari e indici*, 3 vols. Rome.
- Parmentier, E. and Barone, F. P. (2011) *Nicolas de Damas. Histoires, Recueils de coutumes, Vie d'Auguste, Autobiographie*. Paris.
- Paul, G. M. (1985) 'Sallust's Sempronia: The Portrait of a Lady', *PLLS* 5: 9–22.
- Pavan, M. and Della Corte, F. (1988) 'Pollione, Gaio Asinio', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, IV. Rome: 172–7.
- Pelling, C. B. R. (1988) *Plutarch. Life of Antony*. Cambridge.
- Pelling, C. B. R. (2012) *Plutarch. Life of Caesar*. Oxford.
- Pina Polo, F. (2010) *The Consul at Rome: The Civil Functions of the Consuls in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge.

- Ramsey, J. T. (1982) 'Cicero, *pro Sulla* 68 and Catiline's Candidacy in 66 BC', *HSCP* 86: 121–31.
- Ramsey, J. T. (2001) 'Did Mark Antony Contemplate an Alliance with his Political Enemies in July 44 B.C.E?', *CQ* 96: 253–68.
- Ramsey, J. T. (2003) *Cicero. Philippics I-II*. Cambridge.
- Ramsey, J. T. (2007) *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae*. Oxford, 2nd ed.
- Ramsey, J. T. (2015) *Sallust. Fragments of the Histories. Letters to Caesar*. Cambridge, Mass. and London.
- Rawson, E. (1973) 'Scipio, Laelius, Furius and the Ancestral Religion', *JRS* 63: 161–74.
- Rawson, E. (1976) '*Homo novus Arpinas ex M. Crassi familia*, [Sallust], *Cic.* 3', *LCM* 1: 93–5.
- Rawson, E. (1982) 'History, Historiography, and Cicero's *Expositio Consiliorum Suorum*', *LCM* 7/8: 121–4.
- Rawson, E. (1991) *Roman Culture and Society. Collected Papers*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA.
- Rawson, E. (1994) 'The Aftermath of the Ides', in *CAH IX*, eds. J. A. Crook et al. Cambridge, 2nd ed.: 468–90.
- Reams, L. E. (1986–87) 'The Strange Case of Sulla's Brother', *CJ* 82: 301–5.
- Reiter, W. (1988) *Aemilius Paullus. Conqueror of Greece*. London, New York and Sydney.
- Rich, J. (2012) 'Making the Emergency Permanent: *auctoritas*, *potestas* and the Evolution of the Principate of Augustus', in Rivière 2012: 37–121.
- Rich, J. and Williams, J. (1999) '*Leges et iura p. R. Restituit*: A New Aureus of Octavian and the Settlement of 28–27 BC', *NC* 159: 169–213.
- Richardson, J. S. (1992) 'The New Augustan Edicts from Northwest Spain', *JRA* 15: 411–15.
- Richardson, J. S. (1996) *The Romans in Spain*. Oxford.
- Richardson, J. S. (2002) 'The New Augustan Edicts from Northwest Spain', *JRA* 15: 411–15.
- Ridley, R. T. (2005) 'The Absent *Pontifex Maximus*', *Historia* 54: 275–300.
- Rivière, Y. (ed.) (2012) *Des réformes augustéennes*. Rome.
- Rodgers, R. H. (2004) *Frontinus. De aquaeductu urbis Romae*. Cambridge.
- Rohr Vio, F. (2009) *Publio Ventidio Basso. Fautor Caesaris, tra storia e memoria*. Rome.
- Rosenblitt, A. (2014) 'The Turning Tide: The Politics of the Year 79 BCE', *TAPA* 144: 415–44.
- Rosenstein, N. (2012) *Rome and the Mediterranean 290 to 146 BC. The Imperial Republic*. Edinburgh.
- Rowe, G. (2013) 'Reconsidering the *auctoritas* of Augustus', *JRS* 103: 1–15.
- Ruciński, S. (2009) *Praefectus urbi. Le Gardien de l'ordre public à Rome sous le Haut-Empire Romain*. Poznań.
- Rüpke, J. (1995) *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit. Die Geschichte der Repräsentation und religiösen Qualifikation von Zeit in Rom*. Berlin and New York.
- Rüpke, J. (2005) *Fasti sacerdotum. Die Mitglieder der Priesterschaften und das sakrale Funktionspersonal römischer, griechischer, orientalischer und jüdisch-christlicher Kulte in der Stadt Rom von 300 v. Chr. bis 499 n. Chr.* Stuttgart.
- Rüpke, J. (2008) *Fasti sacerdotum: A Prosopography of Pagan, Jewish, and Christian Religious Officials in the City of Rome, 300 BC to AD 499*. Oxford.

- Rüpke, J. (2011) *The Roman Calendar from Numa to Constantine: Time, History and the Fasti*. Oxford and Malden.
- Ryan, F. X. (1998) *Rank and Participation in the Republican Senate*. Stuttgart.
- Salomies, O. (1992) *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire*. Helsinki.
- Santangelo, F. (2006) 'Sulla and the Senate: A Reconsideration', *CCGG* 17: 7–22.
- Santangelo, F. (2007) *Sulla, the Elites and the Empire. A Study of Roman Policies in Italy and the Greek East*. Leiden and Boston.
- Santangelo, F. (2008) 'What did the Cloatii do for Gytheum? A Note on Syll.³ 748', *Historia* 58: 361–6.
- Santangelo, F. (2012a) 'From Pompeii to Ameria: Patrimonies and Institutions in the Age of Sulla', in *Gérer les territoires, les patrimoines et les crises. Le Quotidien municipal II*, eds. L. Lamoine, C. Berrendonner, and M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni. Clermont-Ferrand: 417–31.
- Santangelo, F. (2012b) 'Authoritative Forgeries: Late Republican History Re-told in Pseudo-Sallust', *Histos* 6: 27–51.
- Santangelo, F. (2013a) *Divination, Prediction and the End of the Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Santangelo, F. (2013b) 'Priestly *auctoritas* in the Roman Republic', *CQ* 63: 743–63.
- Santangelo, F. (2014a) 'Roman Politics in the 70s B.C.: A Story of Realignment?', *JRS* 104: 1–27.
- Santangelo, F. (2014b) 'Sempre poco allineati: il decennio dopo Silla', in *Lo spazio del non-allineamento a Roma fra Tarda Repubblica e Primo Principato. Forme e figure dell'opposizione politica*, eds. R. Cristofoli, A. Galimberti and F. Rohr Vio. Rome: 1–23.
- Santangelo, F. (2016) 'Performing Passions, Negotiating Survival: Italian Cities in the Late Republican Civil Wars', in *Civil War in Ancient Greece and Rome: Contexts of Disintegration and Reintegration*, eds. H. Börm, M. Mattheis and J. Wienand. Stuttgart: 127–48.
- Santini, C. (1996) 'Pun. 8, 446–462: l'Umbria di Silio Italico', in *Assisi e gli Umbri nell'antichità*, eds. G. Bonamente and F. Coarelli. Assisi: 517–30.
- Santini, C. and Santucci, F. (eds.) (2004) *Properzio fra storia arte mito*. Assisi.
- Scardigli, B. (1983) *Grani Liciniani Reliquiae*. Florence.
- Schäfer, T. (1989) *Imperii insignia. Sulla curulis und fascies. Zur Repräsentation römischer Magistrate*. Mainz.
- Scheid, J. (2005) 'Augustus and Roman Religion: Continuity, Conservatism and Innovation', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, ed. K. Galinsky. Cambridge: 175–94.
- Schiesaro, A. (2010) 'Cesare, la cultura di un dittatore', in *Cesare: precursore o visionario?*, ed. G. Urso. Pisa: 241–7.
- Schietinger, G.-P. (2013) 'Ein politischer Zielsohn der Caecilii Metelli? Biographische Anmerkungen zu Sulla', *Gymnasium* 120: 207–27.
- Schultz, C. E. (2006) 'Juno Sospita and Roman Insecurity in the Social War', in *Religion in Republican Italy*, eds. C. E. Schultz and P. B. Harvey Jr. Cambridge: 207–27.
- Scullard, H. H. (1951) *Roman Politics 220–150 B.C.* Oxford.
- Seager, R. (1964) 'The First Catilinarian Conspiracy', *Historia* 13: 338–47.

- Seager, R. (2002) *Pompey the Great. A Political Biography*. Oxford, 2nd ed.
- Seager, R. (2007) 'The Guilt or Innocence of Sex. Roscius', *Athenaeum* 95: 895–910.
- Sensi, L. (1990) 'Gli ottoviri di Plestia', *BSCF* 9: 455–62.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1960) *Towards a Text of Cicero: Ad Atticum*. Cambridge.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1966) *Cicero's Letters to Atticus. Volume V*. Cambridge.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1971) *Cicero*. London.
- Shatzman, I. (1975) *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics*. Brussels.
- Shaw, B. D. (2007) 'Sabinus the Muleteer', *CQ* 57: 132–8.
- Shelton, J. A. (2013) *The Women of Pliny's Letters*. Abingdon and New York.
- Simpson, C. J. (2007) 'Why March? The Hereditary Julian Pontifices Maximi and the Date of Julius Caesar's Assassination', *Latomus* 66: 327–35.
- Sisani, S. (2001) *Tuta Ikuvina. Sviluppo e ideologia della forma urbana a Gubbio*. Rome.
- Sisani, S. (2007) *Fenomenologia della conquista. La romanizzazione dell'Umbria tra il IV sec. a.C. e la guerra sociale*. Rome.
- Sisani, S. (2009) *Umbroorum gens antiquissima Italiae: studi sulla società e le istituzioni dell'Umbria preromana*. Perugia.
- Sisani, S. (2010) 'Gubbio: nuove riflessioni sulla forma urbana', *ArchClass* 61: 75–134.
- Skinner, M. D. (2011) *Clodia Metelli. The Tribune's Sister*. Oxford.
- Skutsch, O. (1972) 'Readings and Interpretations in the Annals', in *Ennius*, eds. O. Skutsch. Vandoeuvres and Geneva: 3–29.
- Smith, C. (2010) 'Caesar and the History of Early Rome', in *Cesare: precursore o visionario?*, ed. G. Urso. Pisa: 249–64.
- Spann, P. O. (1987) *Quintus Sertorius and the Legacy of Sulla*. Fayetteville.
- Staveley, E. S. (1956) 'The Constitution of the Roman Republic 1940–1954', *Historia* 5: 74–122.
- Staveley, E. S. (1963) 'The fasces and imperium maius', *Historia* 12: 458–84.
- Stem, R. (2012) *The Political Biographies of Cornelius Nepos*. Ann Arbor.
- Stepper, R. (1999) 'Der Oberpontifikat von Caesar bis Nerva: Zwischen Tradition und Innovation', in *Zwischen Krise und Alltag: Antike Religionen im Mittelmeerraum*, eds. C. Batsch, U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser and R. Stepper. Stuttgart: 171–85.
- Stern, E. von (1883) *Catilina und die Parteikämpfe in Rom der Jahre 66–63 v. Chr.* Dorpat.
- Stevenson, T. R. (2015) *Julius Caesar and the Transformation of the Roman Republic*. Abingdon and New York.
- Stockton, D. (1971) *Cicero. A Political Biography*. Oxford.
- Stok, F. (2013) 'Triumviri agris dividendis: una leggenda virgiliana', *Argos* 36: 9–27.
- Stone, M. (2013) 'A Year of One's Own: Dating the Praetorship of Marcus Crassus', *Antichthon* 47: 101–17.
- Strasburger, H. (1938) *Caesars Eintritt in die Geschichte*. Munich.
- Stratton, K. B. (2007) *Naming the Witch. Magic, Ideology and Stereotype in the Ancient World*. New York and Chichester.
- Strisino, J. (2002) 'Sulla and Scipio "not to be trusted"? The Reasons why Sertorius captured Suessa Aurunca', *Latomus* 61: 33–40.
- Strocchi, F. (1996) 'L'autore del *Bellum Hispaniense*', *RIL* 130: 99–112.
- Sumner, G. V. (1964) 'Manius or Mamercus', *JRS* 54: 41–8.

- Sumner, G. V. (1965) 'The Consular Elections of 66 B. C.', *Phoenix* 19: 226–31.
- Sumner, G. V. (1971) 'The *Lex Annalis* under Caesar', *Phoenix* 25: 246–71, 357–71.
- Sumner, G. V. (1973) *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology*. Toronto.
- Szramkiewicz, R. (1975) *Les Gouverneurs de province à l'époque augustéenne*, I. Paris 1975.
- Tansey, P. (2000) 'The Princeps Senatus in the Last Decades of the Republic', *Chiron* 30: 15–30.
- Tansey, P. (2007) 'Messalla Corvinus and the *Bellum Siculum*', *Latomus* 66: 882–90.
- Tansey, P. (2011) 'A Note on the *repulsae* of L. Aemilius Paullus', *Athenaeum* 99: 185–8.
- Tatum, W. J. (1999) *The Patrician Tribune. Publius Clodius Pulcher*. Chapel Hill.
- Tatum, W. J. (2008) *Always I Am Caesar*. Oxford and Malden.
- Taylor, L. R. (1942a) 'Caesar's Colleagues in the Pontifical College', *AJP* 63: 385–412.
- Taylor, L. R. (1942b) 'Caesar and the Roman Nobility', *TAPA* 73: 1–24.
- Taylor, L. R. (1942c) 'The Election of the Pontifex Maximus in the Late Roman Republic', *CP* 37: 421–4.
- Taylor, L. R. (1949) *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*. Berkeley.
- Taylor, L. R. (1960) *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic. The Thirty-five Urban and Rural Tribes*. Ann Arbor.
- Tempest, K. (2011) *Cicero. Politics and Persuasion in Ancient Rome*. London and New York.
- Thein, A. (2006) 'Sulla the Weak Tyrant', in *Ancient Tyranny*, ed. S. Lewis. Edinburgh: 238–49.
- Thein, A. (2016) 'Booty in the Sullan Civil War of 83–82 B.C.', in *Historia*. 65: 450–72.
- Thomasson, B. E. (1987) 'Kein *legatus pro consule*', *ZPE* 68: 275–6.
- Toher, M. (2009) 'Divining a Lost Text: Augustus' Autobiography and the *BIOΣ KAIΣΑΠΟΣ*', in *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus and the Development of Roman Autobiography*, eds. C. Smith and A. Powell. Swansea: 125–44.
- Tortoriello, A. (2004) *I Fasti consolari degli anni di Claudio*. Rome.
- Treggiari, S. (1969) *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*. Oxford.
- Treggiari, S. (2007) *Terentia, Tullia and Publilia. The Women of Cicero's Family*. Abingdon and New York.
- Twyman, B. L. (1972) 'The Metelli, Pompeius and Prosopography', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 1.1. Berlin and New York: 816–74.
- Van Haepelen, F. (2002) *Le Collège pontifical (3^{ème} s. a. C.–4^{ème} s. p. C.). Contribution à l'étude de la religion publique romaine*. Brussels and Rome.
- Vassileiou, A. (1974) 'Le riche Calvisius Sabinus (Sénèque, *Ep.*, 27, 5–8)', *AC* 43: 241–56.
- Vervaet, F. J. (2014) *The High Command in the Roman Republic. The Principle of the summum imperium auspiciumque from 509 to 19 BCE*. Stuttgart.
- Ward, A. M. (1977) *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic*. Columbia and London.
- Wardle, D. (2009) 'Caesar and Religion', in *A Companion to Julius Caesar*, ed. M. Griffin, Oxford and Malden: 100–11.

- Wardle, D. (2014) *Suetonius. Life of Augustus*. Oxford.
- Watson, A. (1991) *Studies in Roman Private Law*. London and Rio Grande.
- Weigel, R. D. (1992) *Lepidus. The Tarnished Triumvir*. London and New York.
- Weinrib, E. J. (1990) *The Spaniards in Rome from Marius to Domitian*. New York.
- Weinstock, S. (1971) *Divus Julius*. Oxford.
- White, P. (1988) 'Julius Caesar in Augustan Rome', *Phoenix* 42: 334–56.
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1966) 'Virgil and the Evictions', *Hermes* 94: 320–4.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1964) 'Some Republican Senators and Their Tribes', *CQ* 14: 122–33.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1971) *New Men in the Roman Senate. 139 B.C.–14 A.D.* Oxford.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1974) *Cinna the Poet and Other Roman Essays*. Leicester.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1985) *Catullus and His World. A Reappraisal*. Cambridge.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1993) 'The Resplendent Aemilii', in Jocelyn and Hurt: 181–92.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1994) 'Caesar, Pompey and Rome 59–50 B.C.', in *Cambridge Ancient History* 9, eds. J. A. Crook, A. Lintott and E. Rawson. Cambridge, 2nd ed.: 368–423.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1998) *Roman Drama and Roman History*. Exeter.
- Woodman, A. J. (1988) *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies*. London.
- Yakobson, A. (1999) *Elections and Electioneering in Rome. A Study in the Political System of the Late Republic*. Stuttgart.
- Zecchini, G. (1982) 'Asinio Pollione: dall' attività politica alla riflessione storiografica', *ANRW* II, 30.2. Berlin and New York: 1265–96.
- Zecchini, G. (2010) 'Augusto e l'eredità di Cesare', in *Cesare: precursore o visionario?*, ed. G. Urso: 47–62.
- Zevi, F. (1995) 'Personaggi della Pompei sillana', *PBSR* 63: 1–24.

General Index

- Acilius Glabrio, M'. (*cos.* 191 BC) 20 n. 25
 Acilius Glabrio, M'. (*cos.* 67 BC) 148, 155
 Achaea 48, 198
 Acquasparta 297
 Actium, battle/war of 11 n. 28, 117, 217, 229, 234, 239, 243, 248, 252, 264, 265, 308, 309, 314, 321, 322, 323, 326, 335, 354
 Aelius Seianus 126, 127, 173
 Aelius Tubero, Q. 18
 Aemilia (wife of Africanus) 23 n. 45, 25
 Aemilia (Vestal) 51, 159
 Aemilia (Sulla's stepdaughter) 59, 135, 148, 154–5
 Aemilia, Basilica 100
 Aemilia Tertia 23 n. 45
 Aemiliae (daughters of L. Aemilius Paullus) 17–18
 Aemilius (herald) 23
 Aemilius Lepidus, M. (*cos.* 187, 175 BC) 18, 19, 32, 33, 38, 45, 46, 47, 341, 342
 Aemilius Lepidus, M. (*cos.* 126 BC) 42–3
 Aemilius Lepidus, M. (*cos.* 78 BC) 57, 67, 70, 74, 75, 93–110, 111, 177 n. 29, 346
 Aemilius Lepidus, M. (*cos.* 46 BC) 96, 99, 114, 222
 Aemilius Lepidus, M'. (*cos.* 158 BC) 38, 183 n. 7
 Aemilius Lepidus, M'. (*cos.* 66 BC) 113–14, 149
 Aemilius Lepidus, Paullus (*cos.* 50 BC) 96
 Aemilius Lepidus, Paullus (*cos. suff.* 34 BC) 136, 353
 Aemilius Lepidus, Q. 94
 Aemilius Lepidus Livianus, Mam. (*cos.* 77 BC) 112, 113, 347–8, 349
 Aemilius Lepidus Porcina, M. (*cos.* 137 BC) 39, 43, 50, 176, 347
 Aemilius Paullus, L. (*cos.* 216, 219) 16
 Aemilius Paullus, M. (*cos.* AD 1) 136
 Aemilius Paullus Macedonicus, L. (*cos.* 182, 168 BC) 31, 32, 36, 37, 46, 48, 101, 339–40
 Aemilius Scaurus, M. (*cos.* 115 BC) 59, 94, 120, 121, 137, 148, 154–5, 190, 354
 Aeneas 235, 237, 241, 243, 244, 245, 248, 253, 275, 276, 326, 374
 Aesernia 286
 Aesis 273, 282, 283, 284
 Afranius, L. (*cos.* 60 BC) 146, 324
 Africa 30, 57, 60, 62, 68, 70, 71, 72, 74, 86, 95, 124, 136, 150, 167, 171, 251, 303, 335, 361, 374
 Africa (province of) 140, 180, 222, 327, 329, 331, 332, 335
ager Gallicus 273, 275, 282, 284, 293, 299, 301, 302, 311, 312
 Agrippa Postumus, 116
 Alba Longa 98, 190, 237
 Albinovanus, P. 115
 Alexander the Great 73, 234, 238
 Alexandria 246
 Alfenus 82
 Alfenus Varus, P. (*cos. suff.* 39 BC) 213 n. 13, 214, 215, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 229, 330, 372
 Alfenus Varus, P. (*cos.* AD 2) 223
 Allobroges 129, 158, 166, 167
 Ameria 61, 64, 67, 83, 84, 88, 118, 273, 274, 279, 288, 289, 292, 296, 303, 305, 313, 315, 346
 Amiternum 174, 280, 295, 354, 355
 Ampius Balbus, T. 56, 186 n. 4
 Ancharius 17
 Ancharius Rufus, C. 305
 Anchises 237, 241, 245, 248, 249, 250, 374
 Ancona 273, 282, 283, 284, 285, 302, 307
 Ancus Marcius 44, 55
Anio novus 49–50
 Annia 97, 136 n. 68, 154
 Annius, Q. 166
 Annius Appius, M. 303
 Annius Chilo, Q. 166
 Annius Luscus, T. (*cos.* 153 BC) 40 n. 102
 Antenor 227
 Antiochus III 30, 31
 Antistia 135, 154, 357
 Antistius, P. 135, 155
 Antistius Vetus, C. 146
 Antium 198, 200
 Antonius, C. (*cos.* 63 BC) 130, 143, 162–3, 168, 180, 185
 Antonius, M. (*cos.* 99 BC) 51, 137, 261 n. 21, 355
 Antonius, M. (*cos.* 44 BC) 7, 54, 114, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 175, 177, 179, 180, 183, 185, 196, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 207, 208, 209, 212, 214 n. 15, 217, 222, 223, 225, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 235, 236, 242, 244, 246, 252, 257, 262, 263, 292, 307, 308, 309, 311, 312, 320, 325, 328, 330–1, 332, 333, 334, 335, 353, 355, 364, 367, 370, 371, 381

- Antonius Creticus, M. (*pr.* 74 BC) 113, 139, 143, 161, 184, 185, 256
 Antonius Pietas, L. (*cos.* 41 BC) 218, 291, 307, 325
 Antonius Primus, M. 287
 Apollo 138, 233 n. 9, 248 n. 73
 Apollonia 120, 221, 331
 Apennines 272, 275, 279, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 287, 302, 304, 311
 Appuleia 96, 97, 99, 102, 346
 Appuleius Saturninus, L. 94, 96, 97, 102, 111, 189
 Apulia 184, 319
Aqua Marcia 49
 Aquileia 36
 Aquilius Gallus, C. (*pr.* 66 BC) 143
 Ardiaei 39, 117
 Aricia 180
 Ariminum 273, 282, 283, 284, 292, 293, 299, 302, 306, 307, 312
 Arna 274, 296
 Arpinum 84, 92, 113, 120, 121, 137–9, 165, 174, 239, 354, 355, 366
 Arretium 274, 275, 277, 279, 284, 291, 302, 315, 316
 Arrius 213
 Arrius, Q. 163, 360
 Arruntia 160
 Arruntius, L. 160
 Ascalis 122, 123, 124, 126, 352
 Asculum 52 n. 58, 54 n. 72, 94, 114, 155, 184 n. 14, 328, 347
 Asia, province of 53, 82 n. 20, 113, 137, 139, 143, 145, 148, 149, 150, 192, 203, 319
 Asia Minor 2, 31
 Asinius Epicadus 116, 350
 Asinius Pollio, C. (*cos.* 40 BC) 8, 116, 215, 223, 229, 291, 306, 309, 329, 332, 336, 372, 373
 Asinius Gallus Saloninus, C. 212, 236 n. 23
 Asisium 272, 275, 296, 297, 303, 308, 309, 312, 313, 320, 329
 Athens 131 n. 26, 136 n. 58–9
 Atia 53
 Atiedius 319
 Atilius Regulus, M. 48 n. 27
 Atilius Serranus, A. (*cos.* 170 BC) 36, 48, 341
 Atius Labienus, T. (*tr. pl.* 63 BC) 186, 188, 189, 324, 369
 Attidii 312
 Attidium 125 n. 25, 275, 282, 283, 284, 312
 Attius Celsus, C. 139, 355
auctoritas 61 n. 24, 75, 93, 107, 150, 161, 171, 197, 199 n. 12, 207, 256, 264, 266, 321, 374, 375, 377
 Audasius, L. 116
 Aufidena 125 n. 25
 Aufidii 143–4, 157, 357
 Aufidius, Cn. 144, 157
 Aufidius, T. 143
 Aufidius Orestes, Cn. (*cos.* 71 BC) 144, 155, 156, 157, 357
 augur 21, 44, 136, 190 n. 35, 191 n. 40, 193, 195, 256, 257, 323 n. 211, 353, 369
 Aurelia 51
 Aurelia Orestilla 154, 155, 156, 157, 357
 Aurelius, M. 330
 Aurelius Cotta, C. (*cos.* 74 BC) 145, 316 n. 161, 350
 Aurelius Cotta, C. (*cos.* 65 BC) 140, 150, 169, 208
 Aurelius Cotta, L. (*cos.* 144 BC) 42, 59
 Aurelius Cotta, L. (*cos.* 119 BC) 51
 Aurelius Orestes, L. (*cos.* 126 BC) 42
 Aurelius Orestes, L. (*cos.* 103 BC) 42
 Ausidius Montanus, L. 319
auspicium 240, 255
 Autronius Paetus, P. 140, 150, 151, 152, 153, 158, 161, 164, 166, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 184, 185, 265, 355, 359, 362
 Auximum 283, 318
 Baebii 20
 Baebius, A. 20 n. 24
 Baebius, L. 20, 31 n. 39
 Baebius Dives, L. 20, 31 n. 39
 Baebius Tamphilus, Cn. 19, 20
 Balearic Islands 124
 Bardyaei 117, 350
 Bellienus, L. 159, 190
bellum Siculum 323, 327, 331, 381
 Beneventum 217, 286, 307 n. 134, 318, 351
 Béranger, J. 8
 Berones 117
 Bilbilis 126
 Birley, A. R. 1, 2, 4, 6, 10
 Bogud 122
 Bona Dea 193
 Bononia 139, 235, 308
 Bovillae 191 n. 39, 233
 Bracciano Lake 287
 Brundisium 206, 209, 210, 212, 222, 225, 226, 227, 229, 260, 330, 349
 Brunt, P. A. 11
 Bruttians 318
 Burrienus (*pr.* 83 BC) 100

- Caecilia Metella (daughter of *cos.* 123) 61, 84–6, 87, 89, 90, 91, 305, 346
- Caecilia Metella (Sulla's wife) 67, 89, 96 n. 14
- Caecilia Metella (daughter of *cos.* 69) 147
- Caecilii Metelli 5, 26, 53, 59, 60, 66, 67, 68, 69, 78, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 93, 94, 97, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 110, 141, 142, 146, 147, 155, 159, 193, 303, 343, 346, 348
- Caecilius Metellus, L. (*cos.* 68 BC) 147
- Caecilius Metellus, M. (*pr.* 69 BC) 87
- Caecilius Metellus Balaricus, Q. (*cos.* 123 BC) 61, 84
- Caecilius Metellus Celer, Q. (*tr. pl.* 90 BC) 87
- Caecilius Metellus Celer, Q. (*cos.* 60 BC) 59 n. 15, 67, 68, 87, 100, 142, 147, 171, 189
- Caecilius Metellus Creticus, Q. (*cos.* 69 BC) 87, 142, 147, 180, 184, 185
- Caecilius Metellus Delmaticus, L. (*cos.* 119 BC) 159, 193 n. 58
- Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus, Q. (*cos.* 143 BC) 50
- Caecilius Metellus Nepos, Q. (*cos.* 98 BC) 85, 104
- Caecilius Metellus Nepos, Q. (*cos.* 57 BC) 59 n. 15, 67, 68, 87, 100–1, 129, 130, 134, 142, 147, 353
- Caecilius Metellus Pius, Q. (*cos.* 80 BC) 59, 60, 67, 68, 69, 70, 79, 81, 86, 91, 95, 101, 105, 113, 115, 142, 146, 150, 186, 193, 195, 325, 344
- Caecilius Metellus Scipio, Q. (*cos.* 52 BC) 26, 86, 113, 145, 147, 163, 165, 180, 187
- Caecilius Rufus, L. 170, 362
- Caelius Rufus, M. 130, 135, 353
- Caecina, A. 10 n. 24, 210, 316, 333
- Caeparius, M. 166, 167
- Caere 300
- Caesaragusta 127
- Caesius, L. 139
- Caesonius, M. 139
- Caiatia 182 n. 4
- Calabria 330
- Calaguris 126, 146
- Calagurritani 117
- Calidius, Q. 85, 86 n. 49
- Caligula 336
- Callimachus 272, 275
- Calpurnii 30, 37, 40, 42
- Calpurnius Bibulus, M. 168, 194
- Calpurnius Bestia, L. (*tr. pl.* 162 BC) 6, 128–35, 135, 166, 167, 177 n. 29, 348, 352, 353, 361
- Calpurnius Piso, C. (*cos.* 180 BC) 32
- Calpurnius Piso, C. (*cos.* 67 BC) 148, 356
- Calpurnius Piso, Cn. (*cos.* 139 BC) 41
- Calpurnius Piso, Cn. (q. 65 BC) 152, 158, 160, 162, 174 n. 5, 358
- Calpurnius Piso, Cn. (*cos.* 7 BC) 336
- Calpurnius Piso Frugi, L. (*cos.* 133 BC) 40
- Calpurnius Piso Frugi, L. (*pr.* 74 BC) 145, 148
- Calpurnius Piso, L. (*cos.* 58 BC) 201, 208, 371
- Calvisia Flaccilla 336
- Calvisius, P. (*cos. suff.* ca. AD 54) 338
- Calvisius Aiiionis f. Galeria Sabinus, C. 330 n. 267
- Calvisius Ruso Julius Frontinus (*cos. suff.* AD 79) 338
- Calvisius Sabinus, C. (*cos.* 39 BC) 206, 222, 265, 318, 319, 320–35, 381
- Calvisius Sabinus, C. (*cos.* 4 BC) 336, 337
- Calvisius Sabinus (*cos.* AD 26) 332, 336, 337, 338, 382
- Calvisius Sabinus Pomponius Secundus, P. (*cos. suff.* AD 44) 337, 338, 382
- Calvisius Silo, C. 319
- Calvisius Tullus Ruso, P. (*cos.* AD 109) 330, 338
- Camerinum 9 n. 20, 274, 276, 279, 281, 282–6, 292, 294, 295, 298, 299, 302, 303, 306, 308, 311, 379, 380
- Campania 28, 171, 207, 209, 224, 275, 291, 299, 306, 310, 328
- Campus Martius 19, 57 n. 6, 109, 191 n. 44
- Cannae 16, 18, 276, 318
- Canusium 319, 329, 351
- Capitol 49, 50 n. 36, 158, 204, 208, 243, 269
- Capua 27, 28, 43, 147, 168, 299, 307 n. 134
- Carducci, G. 290
- Carisius 319
- Carisius, P. 329
- Carrhae 124
- Carrinas, C. (*pr.* 83?) 100, 291, 328 n. 249, 330
- Carrinas, C. (*cos. suff.* 43 BC) 265, 328, 330
- Carsulae 121 n. 19, 275, 282, 286, 287, 288, 289, 292, 296, 297, 313
- Carthage 18, 27, 44, 101, 174, 275
- Carvilius, C. 290
- Carvilius Maximus Ruga, Sp. 24, 340
- Casinum 319
- Cassius, C. 317
- Cassius, L. 317
- Cassius Longinus, C. (*cos.* 171 BC) 35–6
- Cassius Longinus C. (*pr.* 44 BC) 11 n. 30, 112, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 205, 208, 211, 321
- Cassius Longinus, L. (*pr.* 66 BC) 144, 145, 162, 166, 167
- Cassius Longinus, Q. 117
- Cassius Longinus Ravilla, L. (*cos.* 127 BC, *cens.* 125 BC) 43 n. 122, 159

- Castor, temple of 130
 Castrum Novum 300
 Centenius, C. 285, 379
 Centumalus Maximus, Cn. (*cos.* 278 BC) 27, 28, 29, 30, 44
 Cicereius, C. 115
 Cilicia 52, 54 n. 72, 66, 70, 82, 83, 102, 120, 122, 137, 148, 161, 256, 257, 258, 260, 293, 355
 Cilnii 274, 279, 281
 Cilnius Maecenas, C. 8, 209, 228, 229, 234, 252, 266, 274, 291, 309, 331, 371, 372, 373
 Ciminian forest 277, 279, 281
 Circeii 99, 188
 Cisalpine Gaul 60, 62, 67, 69, 70, 74, 109, 146, 214, 216, 217, 218, 223, 224, 225, 257, 291, 292, 302, 307, 309, 333, 343, 372
 Civita Castellana 298
civitas sine suffragio 294, 295, 298, 300
civitates foederatae 293, 294, 295, 296, 298
 Claudia (daughter of Fulvia) 203
 Claudii 19, 26, 29, 33, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 46, 52–3, 75, 88, 176, 335, 341
 Claudii Marcelli 48 n. 27, 114, 142, 144, 168
 Claudii Neronēs 18
 Claudius Caecus, Ap. (*cens.* 312 BC) 42
 Claudius Caesar Augustus, Ti. 116, 270
 Claudius Caudex, Ap. (*cos.* 264 BC) 27
 Claudius Centho, C. 28
 Claudius Marcellus, C. (*cos.* 50 BC) 53, 203, 317, 336, 371
 Claudius Marcellus, C. (*cos.* 49 BC) 336
 Claudius Marcellus, L. 168
 Claudius Marcellus, M. (*cos.* IV) 28, 29, 31
 Claudius Marcellus, M. (*pr.* 185 BC) 46 n. 11
 Claudius Marcellus, M. (*pr.* 188 BC, *cos.* 183 BC) 46 n. 11, 48 n. 27
 Claudius Marcellus, M. (*cos.* 166 BC) 48 n. 27
 Claudius Marcellus, M. (*cos.* 152 BC) 38
 Claudius Marcellus, M. (*cos.* 51 BC) 336
 Claudius Marcellus, M. (q. 64 BC) 163
 Claudius Marcellus, M. (*aed.* 23 BC) 248–9
 Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus, M. (*pr.* AD 19) 336
 Claudius Pulcher, Ap. (*pr.* 215 BC, *cos.* 212 BC) 28, 29
 Claudius Pulcher, Ap. (*cos.* 185 BC) 19, 31, 176
 Claudius Pulcher, Ap. (*cos.* 143 BC) 23, 39, 41, 50, 176
 Claudius Pulcher, Ap. (*cos.* 79 BC) 53, 61, 62, 69, 74, 75, 85, 87, 142, 147
 Claudius Pulcher, Ap. (*cos.* 54 BC) 88, 132, 174, 256, 257
 Claudius Pulcher, Ap. (*cos. suff.* 130 BC) 29 n. 27
 Claudius Pulcher, C. (*cos.* 177 BC) 33, 37
 Claudius Pulcher, C. (*cos.* 92 BC) 52
 Claudius Pulcher, C. (*pr.* 55 BC) 114, 130, 132, 135, 136, 165, 171, 174, 177, 178, 185, 193, 194, 213, 317, 350, 358, 359, 360, 362, 363
 Claudius Pulcher, P. (*cos.* 184 BC) 19, 32, 46, 176
 Claudius Pulcher, P. (*aed. cur.* 56 BC) 142
 Cleopatra VII Philopator, queen of Egypt 236, 307, 335
 Clitumnus 272, 286, 288, 290 n. 73, 308
 Clodia (sister of Clodius) 76, 174, 366
 Clodia (wife of D. Junius Brutus Callaicus) 103, 176, 177
 Clodia (mother of D. Junius Brutus) 112
 Clodius *see* Claudius Pulcher, C. (*pr.* 55 BC)
 Clodius Eprius Marcellus, Titus 323
 Cluentius, L. 210–11
 Cluentius Habitus, A. 210
 Clunia 330 n. 267
 Clusium 127, 279, 288, 291, 304, 379
 Clustumina, tribe 296, 297, 303, 380
 Cluvius, C. (?) 217
 Cocceii 319, 320, 381
 Cocceius Balbus, C. 210, 222
 Cocceius Nerva, L. (*cos. suff.* 39 BC) 210, 229
 Cocceius Nerva, M. (*cos.* 34 BC) 210
 Cocceius Nerva Caesar Augustus, M. 9 n. 20
 Colfiorito Marsh 379
 Colfiorito Pass 285, 286, 292
 Colline Gate Battle 52, 57, 70, 95, 343
 colonies 36, 38 n. 95, 41, 109, 127, 167, 170, 217, 221, 274, 276, 278, 280, 282, 284, 286, 287, 288, 290–1, 292, 293, 294, 298, 299, 300, 301, 305, 308, 309, 310, 311, 313, 319, 320, 329, 330, 379, 380
 Cominius, P. 310, 317, 380
 Comum 313
 Coponius, T. 20 n. 21
 Corinth 241
 Coriolanus 44
 Cornelia (mother of the Gracchi) 17 n. 4
 Cornelia (mother of Mam. Livianus) 101
 Cornelia (wife of Paullus Aemilius Lepidus) 136, 147, 354
 Cornelia (daughter of Cinna) 59, 98, 154, 156
 Cornelia (wife of C. Calvisius Sabinus) 336
 Cornelii 5, 18, 19 n. 14, 58, 118, 158, 359
 Cornelii (freedmen) 62, 74
 Cornelii Dolabellae 58 n. 9, 102, 348
 Cornelii Scipiones 339
 Cornelius (scribe) 114, 115, 349
 Cornelius, C. (*tr. pl.* 67 BC) 149, 151, 317
 Cornelius, C. (knight) 166, 167
 Cornelius, L. (*cos. suff.* 38 BC) 222
 Cornelius, Q. 115–16
 Cornelius Balbus, L. (*cos. suff.* 40 BC) 207, 209, 218, 222, 318, 330

- Cornelius Balbus, L. 374
 Cornelius Cethegus, C. 128, 163, 166
 Cornelius Cethegus, P. (*cos.* 181 BC) 33 n. 54
 Cornelius Cethegus, P. 98, 104, 161, 256, 257, 378
 Cornelius Chrysogonus, L. 67, 83, 84, 90, 91, 118, 315, 345
 Cornelius Cinna, L. (*cos.* iv) 59, 60, 63, 64, 97, 98, 99, 102, 106, 111, 116, 117, 138, 154, 158, 191, 291, 348, 349
 Corneli Dolabellae 58 n. 9, 102, 348
 Cornelius Dolabella, Cn. (*cos.* 159 BC) 58 n. 9
 Cornelius Dolabella, Cn. (*cos.* 81 BC) 72, 79, 102
 Cornelius Dolabella, Cn. (*pr.* 81 BC) 58 n. 9, 82, 83, 102
 Cornelius Dolabella, P. (*pr.* 69 BC) 145
 Cornelius Dolabella, P. (*cos.* 44 BC) 103
 Cornelius Epicadus 116, 349
 Cornelius Gallus, C. 80, 90, 214, 215, 218, 223, 224, 229, 372, 373
 Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus, Cn. (*cos.* 72 BC) 100, 142, 146
 Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus, Cn. (*pr.* 59 BC) 142
 Cornelius Lentulus Crus, L. (*cos.* 49 BC) 142
 Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, Cn. (*cos.* AD 26) 336
 Cornelius Lentulus Lupus, L. (*cos.* 156 BC) 49
 Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus, Cn. (*cos.* 56 BC) 142
 Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus, P. 177
 Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus, P. (q. 74 BC) 142
 Cornelius Lentulus Niger, L. (*pr.* 62 BC) 113, 142, 193, 349
 Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, P. (*cos.* 57 BC) 142, 187, 195
 Cornelius Lentulus Sura, P. (*cos.* 71 BC) 128, 142, 158, 166, 185
 Cornelius Lentulus Vatia, Cn. 142, 147
 Cornelius Scipio Africanus, P. 17 n. 4, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 30, 31, 33, 41, 46, 47, 49, 62, 101, 242 n. 48, 340
 Cornelius Scipio Africanus Aemilianus, P. (*cos.* 147, 134 BC) 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 38, 39, 41, 48, 62, 63, 94 n. 2, 176, 314, 341
 Cornelius Scipio Asiagenus, L. (*cos.* 83 BC) 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, 348
 Cornelius Scipio Barbatus, L. (*cos.* 298 BC) 279
 Cornelius Scipio Hispallus, Cn. (*cos.* 176 BC) 33
 Cornelius Scipio Nasica, P. (*cos.* 191 BC) 31
 Cornelius Scipio Nasica, P. (*cos.* 162, 155 BC) 49
 Cornelius Scipio Nasica, P. (*cos.* 111 BC) 86
 Cornelius Scipio Nasica, P. (*pr.* 94 BC) 86, 88, 101
 Cornelius Scipio Nasica, P. (*cos.* 138 BC) 22
 Cornelius Sulla, L. (*cos.* 88, 80 BC) 4, 5–6, 52, 53, 56–78, 79, 81–6, 88, 89–92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102–10, 111, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 135, 137, 141, 142, 145, 148, 154, 155, 158, 159, 160, 165, 169, 174, 183, 186, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 239, 240, 242, 256, 257, 262, 291, 304, 305, 306, 307, 310, 314, 315, 316, 328, 342–50, 354, 357, 360
 Cornelius Sulla, L. (*cos.* 5 BC) 172
 Cornelius Sulla, P. 7, 115, 129, 140, 150–2, 153, 155, 166, 167, 168, 169–72, 355, 361, 362, 367, 369
 Cornelius Sulla, Ser. 166, 167, 169
 Cornificius, L. (*cos.* 35 BC) 210, 371
 Cornificius, Q. (*pr.* 66 BC) 143, 144, 156, 162, 360
 Cornificius, Q. (*pr.* 45 BC) 331, 332, 333
 Cortona 277, 279
 Coruncanus, Ti. (*cos.* 280 BC, dict. 246 BC) 27, 186 n. 5
 Cosa Volcientium 300 n. 107
 Cossutia 98
 Crastinus, C. 317–18
 Cremona 214, 216, 219, 221, 222, 223, 224
 Crete 205
 Critonius, L. 83
 Cuma 127
 Curius Dentatus, M'. (*cos.* 290, 275, 274) 27, 280, 300
 Curius, Q. 133, 166, 167, 183
 Curubi 222 n. 73
 Cyrene 205
 Cyzicus 113, 319
 Dalmatia 116, 117, 118, 212, 213, 227
 Daphnis 230 n. 2
 Dasumius 125, 330
 Decius Mus, P. 278, 284
 Demetrias 20 n. 24
 Demosthenes 80
 Dial Press, The 10
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus 55, 259–60, 261, 264, 343
 Dionysius (Cicero's slave) 117
 Divus Julius 126, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 238, 243, 246, 248, 250, 251, 367
 Domitia Lucilla 338
 Domitius Ahenobarbus, Cn. (*cos.* 192 BC) 20 n. 25
 Domitius Ahenobarbus, Cn. (*cos.* 96 BC) 186, 187, 190
 Domitius Ahenobarbus, Cn. 97 n. 16
 Domitius Calvinus, Cn. 222, 334
 duoviri (municipal) 127 n. 33, 294, 296
 duovir perduellionis 189, 190
 Dyrrachium 227

- Egnatius 274
 Egypt 91, 149, 218, 229, 236, 251, 307, 335
 Eleusis 53 n. 64, 131 n. 26, 136 n. 58
 Emerita Augusta 329
 Ennius, Q. 239
 Erucius, C. 84, 315, 345
 Etpastus 123, 126, 351
 Etruria 10, 78, 109, 127, 128, 160, 163, 187,
 189, 217, 220, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277,
 278, 279, 281, 283, 284, 285, 288, 291, 292,
 298, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 306, 309, 310,
 311, 312, 315, 316, 328, 347
 Fabia (Vestal) 159, 160, 358, 359
 Fabia, tribe 303
 Fabii 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 27, 36, 93, 278
 Fabii Maximi 339
 Fabius Aemilianus, Q. (*cos.* 145 BC) 17, 22,
 23 n. 45, 94 n. 2
 Fabius Labeo, Q. 31 n. 39
 Fabius Maximus, Paullus (*cos.* 11 BC) 54, 136
 Fabius Maximus, Q. (*pr.* 181 BC) 22
 Fabius Maximus Rullianus, Q. (*cos.* V) 278,
 279, 284
 Fabius Maximus Servilianus, Q. (*cos.* 142
 BC) 22
 Fabius Maximus Verrucosus, Q. (*cos.* V) 22,
 27–8, 29, 30, 341
 Fabius Persicus, Paullus (*cos.* AD 34) 136
 Fabius Pictor, Q. 31 n. 39
 Fabius Quintilianus, M. 126
 Fadius, L. 139
 Fadius, T. 139, 335
 Faesulae 109, 128–9 n. 4, 163, 167
 Falerii 288, 298
 Falisci 293, 298
 Fannius, C. (*cos.* 122 BC) 41, 106, 176
 Fannius, M. 83
 Fanum Fortunae 282, 284, 293
fascēs 8, 11, 107, 147, 222, 255–71, 375–8
 Fenestella 81, 126, 127, 345, 351, 352
 Ferentinum 210
fides 58, 236, 321 n. 199, 324, 327
flamen Dialis 22, 191, 192
flamen Divi Iulii 367
flamen Martialis 113, 160, 191, 193
flamen Quirinalis 191
flamen Romae et divi Augusti 330 n. 267
 Flaminius, C. (*cos.* 187 BC) 31, 45, 380
 Flusor 282
 Fonteia 160, 359
 Fonteius, M. 118, 146, 160, 356
 Forum Cassii 316
 Forum Flaminii 282, 287, 288, 294, 295, 297,
 299, 380
 Forum Iulii 218
 Fossato Pass 283, 284
Fratres Arvales 14, 253
 Fregellae 41
 Fufidii 120–1
 Fufidius 120
 Fufidius, L. 107, 119–21
 Fufidius, M. 120
 Fufidius, Q. 120
 Fufius Calenus, Q. 180 n. 55, 208
 Fulginiae 273, 275, 276, 282, 283, 284, 285,
 286, 288, 290, 291, 292, 294, 295, 297, 298,
 299, 305, 308, 311, 315
 Fulvia (wife of M. Antony) 103, 133, 135, 177,
 178, 180, 181, 183, 185, 203, 218, 363, 364
 Fulvia (associate of Catiline) 133, 174 n. 5,
 180–1, 364
 Fulvii 26–43, 46, 103, 182–5, 340–1, 366
 Fulvio-Claudian faction 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45,
 46 n. 11, 50, 51
 Fulvio-Manlian faction 18, 20
 Fulvius (*leg.* 74–71 BC) 184–5
 Fulvius (senator) 184
 Fulvius, A. 182, 184
 Fulvius, Q. 184
 Fulvius Bambalio, M. 177, 178, 180, 183, 185
 Fulvius Centumalus, M. (*pr.* 192 BC) 30 n. 38
 Fulvius Curvus, L. (*cos.* 322 BC) 27
 Fulvius Flaccus, C. (*cos.* 134 BC) 39
 Fulvius Flaccus, C. (*leg.* 211, 209 BC)
 30 n. 36
 Fulvius Flaccus, Cn. (*pr.* 190 BC) 30 n. 38
 Fulvius Flaccus, Cn. 182
 Fulvius Flaccus, Cn. (*pr.* 212 BC) 30 n. 36
 Fulvius Flaccus, Cn. (*pr.* 167 BC) 37 n. 82
 Fulvius Flaccus, M. (*cos.* 264 BC) 27
 Fulvius Flaccus, M. (*tr. pl.* 199 BC) 30 n. 38
 Fulvius Flaccus, M. (*tr. mil.* 180 BC) 41
 Fulvius Flaccus, M. (*leg.* 171, 170 BC) 37 n. 82
 Fulvius Flaccus, M. (*cos.* 125 BC) 41, 42, 43,
 50–1, 182, 364
 Fulvius Flaccus, Q. (*pr.* 215 BC) 29 n. 25
 Fulvius Flaccus, Q. (*tr. pl.* 197 BC) 30 n. 38
 Fulvius Flaccus, Q. (*epulo* 180 BC) 37 n. 82
 Fulvius Flaccus, Q. (*cos. suff.* 180 BC) 32,
 36 n. 73
 Fulvius Flaccus, Q. (*cos.* 179 BC) 20, 21, 32,
 34, 35, 36 n. 73
 Fulvius Flaccus, Q. (*cos.* IV) 27–8, 30,
 187, 341
 Fulvius Flaccus, Ser. (*cos.* 135 BC) 39, 40
 Fulvius Gillo Bittius Proculus, Q. 337
 Fulvius Maximus Centumalus, Cn. (*cos.* 298
 BC, *dict.* 263 BC) 27, 44
 Fulvius Maximus Centumalus, Cn. (*cos.* 211
 BC) 28, 29
 Fulvius Neratus, P. 184

- Fulvius Nobilior, M. (*cos.* 189 BC) 18, 31, 32, 33, 45
 Fulvius Nobilior, M. (*cos.* 159 BC) 38
 Fulvius Nobilior, Q. (*cos.* 153 BC) 39, 40, 50
 Fulvius Nobilior, M. 166, 167, 180, 183
 Fulvius Paetinus, M. 280
 Fulvius Paetinus, Ser. (*cos.* 309 BC) 27
 Fulvius Setinus 184
 Furfanius Postumus, T. 317
 Furies 243
 Furi 18
 Furius, P. 166, 167
 Furius Camillus, M. (*dict.* 367 BC) 241, 247
 Furius Crassipes 362
 Furius Leptinus 184 n. 18
 Furius Purpureo, L. 31
 Furius Setinus 184

 Gabinius, A. (*cos.* 58 BC) 144, 148, 150, 151, 164, 170, 171
 Gabinius Capito, P. 163, 166, 167
 Gades 218, 222, 287, 318, 330, 351
 Galatia 210
 Galatians 31
 Galba 21, 276
 Gallienus 213
 Gallus (emperor) 290
 Gallus Antipater 120
 Gauls 34, 241, 243, 247, 248, 272, 273, 278, 283, 293, 300, 302
 Gellius Poplicola, L. (*cos.* 72 BC) 146, 353
 Gellius Poplicola, L. (*cos.* 36 BC) 131, 136, 353
 Gentius 290
 Germania Superior 336, 337
 Germany 219, 275, 279
 Gothic War 286, 290
 Gratidia 138, 154, 355, 357
 Gratidii 137, 138, 154, 355, 357
 Gratidius, M. 137, 354
 Greece 16, 31, 47, 92, 95, 193, 196, 199, 232, 370

 Hades 233 n. 9
 Hadria 300
 Hadrian 3 n. 6, 289
 Hannibal 27, 30, 34, 119–20, 284, 285, 290, 299
 Hannibalic War 27, 28, 30, 34, 39, 285, 290, 299, 301
 Harris, W. V. 10
 Hellas *see* Greece
 Helvia 138
 Helvillum 283
 Helvius Cinna, C. (*tr. pl.* 44 BC) 202
 Helvius Cinna, C. (poet) 224
 Herculaneum 319
 Herennius, M. 52
 Herod 136
 Hirrus 261 n. 21
 Hirtius, A. (*cos.* 43 BC) 199, 208
 Hispania Citerior 152, 359
 Hispania Ulterior 70, 111, 117, 119, 123, 124, 125, 218, 350, 356
 Hispellum 275, 296, 308
Historia Augusta 1, 4, 6, 120, 213
Horatia (tribe) 319
 Horatius Flaccus, Q. 55, 120, 219, 221, 222 n. 71, 229, 237, 246, 247, 249, 250, 252, 350, 372, 373
 Hortensius, L. 176
 Hortensius Hortalus, Q. (*cos.* 69 BC) 53, 88, 89, 99, 145–6, 148, 155, 158, 169, 171, 176, 177, 183 n. 10, 346, 362
 Hostilia Quarta 32, 36 n. 73
 Hostilii 30, 37, 42
 Hostilii Mancini 36 n. 73
 Hostilius Mancinus, A. (*cos.* 170 BC) 21, 36
 Hostilius Mancinus, C. (*cos.* 137 BC) 39

 Ides of March 12, 54, 116, 132, 198, 318, 324, 332, 334
 Iguvium 273, 282, 290, 294, 303, 304, 306, 308, 379, 380
 Ilia/Julia 96 n. 14
 Ilium 125 n. 25, 246
 Illyricum 35, 39, 62, 116, 117, 226, 227, 335
imperium ix, 8, 11, 63, 82, 106, 109, 193, 235, 237, 255, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 264, 265, 267, 269, 270, 271, 291, 332, 375, 376
imperium consulare 263, 267, 268, 270, 271, 377
imperium infinitum 258
imperium maius 266
imperium proconsulare 375, 377
insignia 259, 261, 264, 267, 269, 271, 275, 276
 Interamna on the Nar 273, 275, 280, 282, 284, 287, 288, 289, 290, 292, 296, 305, 351, 379
 Interamna Praetuttiorum 295, 329
 Ipthas 351
 Isidorus 322
 Istanbul 2, 5
iuridicus Aemiliae et Flaminiae 293

 Janiculum 138, 189
 Janus 236
 Japudes 175, 273
 Jones, A. H. M. 8
 Julia (Augustus' daughter) 354
 Julia (Caesar's daughter) 156
 Julia (daughter of L. Julius Caesar) 185
 Julia (Marius' wife) 51

- Julia *see* Ilia
 Julii 88, 142, 182, 183, 190, 191, 238, 242, 244, 245, 248, 335
 Julius, C. 184, 185
 Julius Caesar, C. 51
 Julius Caesar, C. (*cos.* IV) 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 51, 53, 54, 56, 59–60, 63, 65, 75, 76, 77, 92, 97 n. 16, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 106, 107, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 119, 123, 124, 125, 126, 131, 132, 133, 134, 138, 140, 141, 142, 152, 153, 154, 156, 159, 163, 164, 167, 171, 173, 174, 175, 179, 180, 184, 186–95, 196, 201, 202, 203, 204, 207, 208, 210 n. 21, 211, 214, 215, 217 n. 29, 218, 223, 225, 230–54, 256, 258, 260–1, 262, 263, 264, 265, 291, 306, 307, 308, 309, 312, 314, 317, 318, 320, 321, 322, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 331, 334, 335, 343, 352, 353, 357, 360, 362, 364, 366–70, 373–4, 381
 Julius Caesar, L. (*cos.* 90 BC) 182–3
 Julius Caesar, L. (*cos.* 64 BC) 53 n. 64, 143, 256
 Julius Caesar, L. (son of Sex. Julius Caesar, *cos.* 157 BC) 38 n. 93
 Julius Caesar, L. 372
 Julius Caesar, Sex. (*cos.* 157 BC) 38
 Julius Caesar, Sex. (*pr.* 123 BC) 183
 Julius Caesar, Sex. (*cos.* 91 BC) 51
 Julius Caesar, Sex. (*flamen Quirinalis*) 191
 Julius Caesar Octavianus, C. 8, 53, 54, 62, 63, 65, 88, 136, 196, 222, 225, 228, 229, 230–54, 258, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 275, 276, 286, 307, 308, 310, 311, 314, 320, 322, 325, 326, 328, 331, 332, 334, 335, 373–4
 Julius Caesar Strabo, C. 143
 Julius Civilis 119
 Junii 33, 39, 100, 101, 103, 177
 Junii Bruti 43
 Junius Brutus, L. (*cos.* 509 BC) 63, 259
 Junius Brutus, M. (*cos.* 178 BC) 33
 Junius Brutus, M. (*pr.* 88 BC) 100
 Junius Brutus, M. (*tr. pl.* 83 BC) 101–2, 104, 109
 Junius Brutus, M. (*pr.* 44 BC) 11 n. 30, 99, 103, 132, 196–200, 202, 205, 210, 211, 321, 366, 371, 372
 Junius Brutus, D. (*cos.* 77 BC) 94, 96, 99, 101, 104, 106, 111, 112, 134, 173–5, 177, 178, 181, 348, 363
 Junius Brutus Albinus, D. (*cos. des.* 42 BC) 11 n. 30, 103, 112, 132, 134, 156, 177, 178, 179, 180, 217 n. 29, 353, 363–4
 Junius Brutus Callaicus, D. (*cos.* 138 BC) 39, 42, 103, 111–12, 176, 177 n. 25, 348
 Junius Congus Gracchanus, C. 103
 Junius Damasippus, L. (*pr.* 82 BC) 100
 Junius Silanus, D. (*cos.* 62 BC) 143, 163, 372
 Junius Silanus, D. (*monetalis* 91 BC) 372
 Juno 35, 245, 246
 Juno Sospita 85, 346
 Juventius, Q. 209, 210
 Labienus, T. 218 n. 46, 324 n. 221
 Lacus Clitorius 288
 Landor, W. S. 234
 Lanuvium 143, 160, 162, 190
 Laodicea 293
 Larinum 210, 211
 Last, H. 8
 Latium 26, 42, 237 n. 25, 239, 245, 380
legatus pro praetore 261, 309, 356
leges Juliae 260
 Lepida 113, 157
 Lepidani 160, 348
 Leptasta 122–7, 351–2
 Leucopetra 196, 197, 198, 200, 201, 202, 204, 205, 370, 371
lex curiata 62 n. 32, 255, 257
lex Domitia 186, 187, 190, 368
lex Plotia agraria 190
lex Titia 262, 263
lex Valeria (82 BC) 66
lex Villia Annalis 33, 46
 Liberators 54, 197–201, 203, 204, 324, 363, 364, 370
Libertas 54, 104, 106, 318, 321
 Libitina 267
 Licinia (C. Gracchus' wife) 366
 Licinia (Vestal, 114 BC) 51, 159
 Licinia (Vestal, ca. 69 BC) 159–60, 358
 Licinius Crassus, C. (*cos.* 168 BC) 24, 35
 Licinius Crassus, C. (*tr. pl.* 145 BC) 51 n. 47
 Licinius Crassus, C. (*tr. pl.* 123 BC) 41
 Licinius Crassus, L. 98–9, 348
 Licinius Crassus, M. (*cos.* 70, 55 BC) 76, 81, 90, 95, 100, 124, 125, 126, 127, 140, 141, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 158–65, 274, 291, 304, 346, 358–61, 362
 Licinius Crassus, M. (*cos. suff.* 30 BC) 147, 265
 Licinius Crassus, M. (*cos.* 27 BC) 72, 73, 265
 Licinius Crassus, P. 53 n. 63
 Licinius Crassus, P. (*cos.* 97 BC) 86 n. 53
 Licinius Crassus, P. (*cos.* 171 BC) 21, 24, 35, 37, 259
 Licinius Crassus Mucianus, P. (*cos.* 131 BC) 23, 39, 41, 42, 176, 192, 366
 Licinius Crassus Dives, P. (*cos.* 205 BC) 23, 186, 187

- Licinius Lucullus, L. (*cos.* 74 BC) 53, 67, 113,
 139, 147–8, 161, 256, 261
 Licinius Macer, C. 146, 151
 Licinius Murena, L. (*cos.* 62 BC) 82 n. 19, 160,
 163, 178, 358, 359
 Licinius Philonicus 23
 Licinius Sacerdos, C. (*pr.* 75 BC) 144, 162
 Liguria 20, 21, 35, 46, 47, 113, 272
 Liris 316
 Lissidius 319
 Litternum 19
lituus 193
 Livii 19, 101
 Livius Drusus, C. (*cos.* 147 BC) 19 n. 14,
 24 n. 50
 Livius Drusus, M. (*tr. pl.* 91 BC) 48 n. 26, 52,
 97, 101–2, 109, 112, 304, 315
 Livius Ocella Ser. Sulpicius Galba, L. 337
 Livius Salinator, C. (*cos.* 188 BC) 19, 23 n. 45
 Livy 12, 13, 19, 21, 22, 32, 34, 35, 57, 184 n.
 14, 185 n. 28, 239, 240, 247, 248, 252, 253,
 259, 274, 275, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 284,
 285, 290, 299, 301, 302, 309, 326, 341, 343
 Lollia 144
 Lollius, M. (*cos.* 21 BC) 210
 Lollius Palicanus, M. (*tr. pl.* 71 BC) 144,
 145, 147
 Lucania 318, 326
 Lucanians 296, 304, 306, 318, 328, 330
 Luccaeus, L. 148, 155
 Luceria 286
 Lucilius Hirrus, C. 306
 Lucretii 272
 Lucretius Carus, T. 258, 272, 379
 Lucretius Ofella, Q. 58, 72 n. 94, 98
ludi Apollinares 199, 201
ludi Saeculares 239, 249
ludi triumphales (46 BC) 132
ludi Victoriae Caesaris 202–3, 208, 209
 Lupiae 330
 Luscius, L. 159, 190
 Lutatius Catulus, Q. (*cos.* 78 BC) 57, 66, 74,
 75, 76, 78, 94, 105, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112,
 118, 145, 148, 150, 159, 161, 182, 183 n. 10,
 187, 190, 344, 348, 355
 Maccius Plautus, T. 272, 310
 Macedonia 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 34, 35, 36,
 37, 47, 48, 50, 53, 54, 62, 69, 70, 72, 73, 93,
 102, 116, 118, 120, 130, 198, 225, 227, 228,
 233, 234, 265, 290, 293, 331, 332
 Maharbal 285
 Malaca 124, 126, 127
 Mamerci 113
 Mamercius 113, 139
 Mamercus 113
 Mamillii 26
 Mamilius Vitulus, L. (*cos.* 265 BC) 27
 Mamilius Vitulus, Q. (*cos.* 262 BC) 27
 Mamurra 218
 Manilius/Manlius 120
 Manilius, C. (*tr. pl.* 66 BC) 148, 151
 Manilius, M. (*cos.* 149 BC) 40
 Manlius, C. 163
 Manlius Acidinus, L. (*pr.* 210 BC) 30, 32 n. 49
 Manlius Acidinus Fulvianus, L. (*cos.* 179
 BC) 20, 32, 46 n. 11
 Manlius Torquatus, A. (*cos.* 164 BC) 37, 150
 Manlius Torquatus, L. (*cos.* 65 BC) 140, 150,
 151, 152, 169, 171, 356
 Manlius Torquatus, L. (*pr.* 49 BC) 171
 Manlius Torquatus, T. (*cos.* 235, 224 BC) 29,
 30, 37, 187
 Manlius Torquatus, T. (*cos.* 165 BC) 37, 150
 Manlius Vulso, A. (*cos.* 178 BC) 31 n. 44, 33
 Manlius Vulso, Cn. (*cos.* 189 BC) 18, 31, 45
 Manlius Vulso, L. (*pr.* 197 BC) 31, 37
 Manlius Vulso, P. 30
 Mantua 212–16, 220, 224, 276, 309
 Magnesia 31, 101
 Malemnus 330
 Marcellus, L. 168
 Marcia (Cato's wife) 53
 Marcia (Paullus Fabius Maximus's wife) 136
 Marcia (Sempronius Atratinus' wife) 354
 Marcia (Vestal) 51, 159
 Marcia (wife of Regulus) 48 n. 27
 Marcii 44–55, 341–2
 Marcius, M. 44 n. 3, 45
 Marcius M'. f. M. 50 n. 43
 Marcius, Q. (*cos. suff.* 36 BC) 54
 Marcius Censorinus, C. 52
 Marcius Censorinus, C. (*cos.* 8 BC) 54–5
 Marcius Censorinus, Cn. (*tr.* 123 or 122
 BC) 50
 Marcius Censorinus, L. (*cos.* 149 BC) 44, 45,
 49, 53
 Marcius Censorinus, L. (*tr. mon.* 83 BC) 52 n.
 60, 53 n. 63
 Marcius Censorinus, L. (*cos.* 39 BC) 54, 206,
 222, 228, 324, 331
 Marcius Crispus, Q. 54 n. 72
 Marcius Figulus, C. (*cos.* 64 BC) 45 n. 5,
 53, 143
 Marcius Figulus, C. (*cos.* 162, 156 BC) 45,
 49, 50
 Marcius Philippus, L. (*cos.* 91 BC) 112, 161
 Marcius Philippus, L. (*cos.* 56 BC) 53, 203,
 207, 341, 342, 343, 371
 Marcius Philippus, Q. (*cos.* 281 BC) 44
 Marcius Philippus, Q. (*cos.* 186, 169) 21, 23 n.
 45, 45, 48–9, 112, 341–2

- Marcius Rex, Q. (*pr.* 144 BC) 49, 51
 Marcius Rex, Q. (*cos.* 118 BC) 45, 51
 Marcius Rex, Q. (*cos.* 68 BC) 53
 Marcius Rutilus, C. (*cos.* 357 BC) 44
 Marcius Rutilus, C. (*cos.* 310 BC, *cens.* 294, 265 BC) 44
 Maria-Laach 1
 Marius, C. (*cos.* VII) 42, 51, 52, 53, 58, 59, 65, 84, 92, 93, 94, 97–8, 100, 116, 117, 118, 120, 137, 142, 155, 156, 165, 183, 189, 191, 242, 256, 274, 290, 291, 303, 304, 306, 311, 314, 315, 316, 317, 320, 328, 350, 354, 366, 380
 Marius, C. (*cos.* 82 BC) 51 n. 50, 70
 Marius, M. 137
 Marius Gratidianus, M. 138, 154
marones 295, 296
 Marrucini 300, 302, 306, 329
 Mars 191 n. 44, 276
 Mars of Todi 274, 379
 Marsi 115, 275, 296, 300, 302, 304, 320, 329
 Matilica 275, 282, 283, 284, 311
 Matius 209
 Matrinius, T. 290, 291, 303, 316
 Matrinius (client of Cicero) 316
 Mauretania 122, 123, 124, 126, 351
 Mediolanum 75
 Meliboeus 228, 230
 Memmius, C. (*tr. pl.* 111 BC) 362
 Memmius, C. 68 n. 68, 170
 Memmius, C. (*tr. pl.* 54 BC) 151, 171, 172
 Memmius, L. 217 n. 34, 362
 Menalcas 214, 216
 Messina 171
 Metrodorus of Scepsis 66 n. 55
 Mevania 273, 274–6, 278–9, 281–4, 286–92, 297, 305, 309, 313
 Milienus Toro 213
 Millar, F. 2
 Mimosius Sardus, Post. 329
 Mimosius 319–20
 Mindius Marcellus, M. 210
 Minotaurus 327, 329
 Minturnae 316
 Minucius Thermus, Q. (*pr.* 53 BC) 306
 Misenum 116
 Mithridates Eupator 66, 146, 242, 250–1, 258
 Modialius, M. 209, 210, 211
 Modius, Q. 211
 Momigliano, A. 6, 367
 Mommsen, T. 8 n. 17, 258, 260, 264, 268, 344, 375–6
 Monte Martano 282
 Monte Somma 286, 288
mos maiorum 255, 257
 Mucia (third wife of Pompey) 59, 67, 68, 146
 Mucia 181
 Mucii 30, 34, 37, 40
 Mucius Orestinus, Q. 357
 Mucius Scaevola, P. (*cos.* 175 BC) 23, 33
 Mucius Scaevola, P. (*cos.* 133 BC) 39, 40, 42
 Mucius Scaevola, Q. (*pr.* 215 BC) 29 n. 25
 Mucius Scaevola, Q. (*cos.* 95 BC) 59 n. 15, 193
 Mummius, L. (*cos.* 146 BC) 241–2
 Munatius Plancus, L. 217, 219, 333, 334
 Munatius Plancus Bursa, T. 131
 Munda 324
municipia 127, 138, 143, 286, 294, 295, 296, 305, 316, 317, 319, 320
 Münzer, F. 4, 5, 339, 352, 363, 364, 366, 372
 Mutina 109, 132, 133, 134, 136, 179, 214 n. 15, 291, 307, 333
 Mytilene 57, 372
 Naevius 26
 Naevius, Sex. 82
 Nahartes 273, 274, 277, 280, 293, 302
 Naples 170, 200, 205, 356
 Nar 273, 277, 278 n. 31, 280, 281, 282, 288, 293, 296, 311, 318
 Narbonese Gaul 218, 297, 314
 Narnia 276, 278, 279, 280, 282, 284, 287, 288, 289, 290, 293, 298, 299, 307, 308, 311, 313, 314, 319, 320, 379
 Narona 116, 117
 Nequinum 274, 278, 280, 281, 293
 Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus 234, 269, 270, 276, 337
 Nicopolis 90
 Nola 28, 57
 Norden, E. 238, 242, 249
 Nuceria 51, 307
 Nuceria Camellaria 282, 283, 297, 313
 Numa Pompilius 239, 330
 Numidia 122, 123, 250–1
 Nursia 118, 275, 289, 295
 Ocriculum 274, 278, 280, 281, 292, 293, 294, 296, 297, 312, 313, 379
 Octavia (Octavian's sister) 53
 Octavian *see* Julius Caesar Octavianus, C.
 Octavius, C. 53
 Octavius Musa 213
 October Horse 191 n. 44
octoviri 294, 295, 380
 Oppius, C. 318
optimates 65, 76, 81, 92, 97, 101, 105, 108, 110, 141, 146, 147, 148, 150, 151, 170, 174, 187, 328
 Oscan 125, 310, 352
 Paciaeci 7, 123–7, 351–2
 Paciaecus 122, 123

- Paciaecus, C. 124
 Paeligni 114, 115, 168, 296, 300, 302, 310,
 329 n. 251
 Paetinus, Ser. (*cos.* 309 BC) 27
 Palatine 114, 231
 Palazzo della Cancelleria 260
Panegyricus Augusti 238–9, 242
 Pannonia 336–7, 338
 Papiria 17, 18, 20, 340
 Papirii 20
 Papirius Carbo, Cn. (*cos.* III) 99
 Papirius Fenestella, L. 127
 Papirius Maso, C. (*cos.* 231 BC) 17, 18, 340
 Papirius Maso, L. (*pr.* 176 BC) 20 n. 21
 Papirius Maso, C. 20 n. 21
 Papirius Masso, C. 274
 Papius 274
 Parthini 116, 227
 Patavium 12, 213, 217, 218, 223, 275, 309
 Paulla Valeria 156
 Peducaeus 319
 Peducaeus, Sex. 159
 Pelling, C. 12, 14
 Peltuinum 125 n. 25, 329 n. 254
 Pentekontaetia 13
perduellio 189, 190
 Perikles 13
 Perpenna *see* vd. Perperna, M. (*cos.* 130 and
 92 BC)
 Perpennia 160
 Perperna, M. (*cos.* 130 BC) 40, 160, 176, 303
 Perperna, M. (*cos.* 92 BC) 52, 58, 70, 98, 106,
 160, 187
 Perseus of Macedon 35, 47, 340, 341
 Perusia 133, 149, 179, 185, 211, 222, 225, 227,
 235, 273, 276–9, 281, 284, 285, 288, 291,
 307–9, 311, 313, 331, 379
 Petillius Spurius, Q. (*cos.* 176 BC) 33 n. 54
 Petreius, M. 324
 Pharsalus 171, 187, 251, 260, 317, 362
 Philippi 11 n. 30, 179, 214, 217, 222, 224, 307,
 309, 321, 334
 Picentes 280, 281, 300
 Picenum 94, 95, 99, 107, 144, 186, 273, 279,
 280–5, 290, 292, 295, 299, 300, 301, 303,
 304, 306, 311, 316, 318, 320, 324, 328, 329
pietas 9, 86, 126, 253, 319, 320–35, 378
 Pinarius Natta, L. 178
 Pirates 76, 117, 118, 122, 137, 148, 150, 160,
 184, 256
 Pistoriae 129, 167
plaga Materina 274
 Plautii 42
 Plautius, A. (*pr.* 51) 160 n. 22, 358
 Plautius Hypsaeus, L. (*pr.* 189 BC) 31 n. 39
 Plautius Hypsaeus, L. (*pr.* 135 BC) 42 n. 118
 Plautius Hypsaeus, M. (*cos.* 125 BC) 42
 Plautius Hypsaeus, P. 165
 Plautius Silvanus, M. (*cos.* 2 BC) 42 n. 119
 Plestia 285, 286, 292, 295, 297–9, 311, 380
 Pliny the Younger 1, 313
 Plotia Hieria 213
 Plutarch 12, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 27, 57, 61, 66,
 71–7, 89, 91, 93, 104, 105, 116, 118, 122,
 123, 124, 127, 159, 165, 202, 203, 240, 344,
 346, 350, 369
 Po 221
 Polybius 25, 48, 262, 283, 285, 290, 367
 Pompeia (wife of P. Sulla) 151, 170, 362
 Pompeia (wife of P. Vatinius) 170
 Pompeia (wife of Julius Caesar) 193–4
 Pompeia Celerina 313
 Pompeii (town) 170, 196, 199, 204,
 350, 362
 Pompeii (*gens*) 94, 99, 144, 303, 311
 Pompeius, A. 305
 Pompeius, Sex. 199, 210, 235, 325, 334
 Pompeius Magnus, Cn. (*cos.* 70, 55, 52 BC) 5,
 11 n. 28, 17 n. 3, 53, 54, 57, 59, 60, 62 n. 30,
 66–78, 71 n. 91, 72, 73, 76, 77, 80, 81, 88, 92,
 95, 99, 103, 104, 105, 108–9, 112, 114, 116,
 122, 123, 124, 127, 129, 135, 141, 146, 147,
 148–51, 154, 155, 160, 161, 162, 165, 170,
 171, 175, 186, 187, 217, 231, 241–2, 243,
 252, 253, 257, 258, 261, 291, 306, 312, 317,
 324, 325, 328, 344, 348, 357, 358, 360, 361,
 362, 373, 374
 Pompeius Rufus, Q. 131, 344
 Pompeius Strabo, Cn. (*cos.* 89 BC) 54 n. 72,
 94, 114, 115, 154, 303, 304, 328, 344, 347
 Pompeius Varus 222 n. 71
 Pomponius Atticus, T. 16 n. 2, 17 n. 3, 132,
 143, 196, 197, 198, 204, 211, 371
 Pompulenus 305
pontifex maximus 7, 18, 21, 23, 24, 27, 32, 33,
 41, 46, 60, 94, 95, 113, 159, 176, 186–95,
 256, 366–70
pontifex minor 349
 Pontius 274
 Pontus 66, 148, 251
 Popilii 20, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 46,
 183 n. 7
 Popillia 38 n. 93, 160, 161
 Popillius, M. (*cos.* 359 BC) 34, 36
 Popillius Laenas, C. (*cos.* 172, 158 BC) 34, 36
 Popillius Laenas, M. (*cos.* 173 BC) 34, 35, 36,
 38, 183 n. 7
 Popillius Laenas, M. (*cos.* 139 BC) 40
 Popillius Laenas, P. (*cos.* 132 BC) 41, 160
 Poppaea Sabina 173
populares 97, 328
 Porcii 27 n. 6

- Porcius Cato, M. (*cos.* 195 BC, *cens.* 184 BC) 16 n. 2, 17, 18, 19, 20 n. 25, 22, 23, 30, 31, 91, 273–5, 302, 340, 365, 380
 Porcius Cato, M. (*pr. des.* ca. 152 BC) 17–18
 Porcius Cato, M. (*pr.* 54) 53, 102, 103, 112, 113, 126, 134, 157, 173–5, 179, 243, 244, 252, 253, 321, 328, 358
 Porcius Laeca, M. 166, 167
 Porcius Licinus, L. 20 n. 25
 Poseidon 233 n. 9
 Postumia (wife of D. Brutus) 135, 177–8
 Postumia (wife of Ser. Sulpicius Rufus) 174, 177
 Postumii 20, 34, 35, 36, 38–42, 45, 46, 48, 177, 340
 Postumius Albinus, Sp. (*cos.* 186 BC) 45
 Postumius Albinus, A. (*cos.* 180 BC) 31 n. 39, 33 n. 54, 34, 45 n. 8
 Postumius Albinus, L. (*cos.* III) 34
 Postumius Albinus, L. (*cos.* 173 BC) 34, 35, 45 n. 8
 Postumius Albinus, L. (*cos.* 154 BC) 38
 Postumius Albinus, Sp. (*cos.* 186 BC) 45
 Postumius Albinus, Sp. (*cos.* 174 BC) 33 n. 54, 34, 45 n. 8
 Postumius Albinus, Sp. (*cos.* 148 BC) 40, 45 n. 8
 Postumius Albinus, Sp. (*cos.* 110 BC) 40
 Postumius Albinus Magnus, Sp. 45 n. 8
 Postumius Tempsanus, L. 45 n. 8
 Praecia 104, 161, 256
praefectus fabrum 218
praetores (municipal) 294
 Praetutii 300
princeps senatus 16 n. 2, 18, 19, 32, 33, 38, 39, 41, 49 n. 33, 58, 76, 88, 94, 98, 190, 344, 377
 Prolaque 283
 Propertius, Sex. 9 n. 20, 149, 379
 Proust, M. 13
provincia 2, 7, 35, 60, 62, 67, 68, 69, 70, 82, 95, 100, 107, 109, 116, 118, 120, 125, 126, 132, 143, 146, 148, 149, 151, 156, 158, 160–1, 179, 192, 197, 198, 199, 200, 205, 206, 212, 217, 218, 224, 225, 227, 232, 249, 255–8, 261, 267, 269–71, 293, 309, 312–13, 314, 317, 319, 323, 331, 332, 333, 338, 341, 352, 359, 375
 Pupius Piso, M. (*pr.* 72) 60, 97, 99, 146, 148, 154, 158, 161, 357
 Pydna 16, 18, 22, 23 n. 45, 36, 37, 38, 93, 95, 302, 341
quaestio de sicariis 159, 190
quaestio repetundarum 137, 143, 146, 150–2
quattuorviri (municipal) 294, 296
 Quinctii 30
 Quinctilius 219
 Quinctilius Varus, P. (*cos.* 13 BC) 213 n. 13, 219
 Quinctius, L. (*tr. pl.* 74 BC) 144, 146, 147, 148
 Quinctius, P. 79, 82, 88
 Quinctius Flaminius, L. (*cos.* 192 BC) 31
 Quinctius Flaminius, T. (*cos.* 198 BC, *cens.* 189 BC) 31 n. 39
 Quintilius 219
 Quirina, tribe 138, 300, 301, 318
 Quirinus 236, 239, 240, 241
 Rabirius, C. 188–9, 190, 191, 368, 369
 Rabirius Postumus, C. 209
 Ravenna 116, 291, 292
 Reate 289
 Remus 236, 243
 Resius, T. 309
rex sacrorum 44, 45, 192
 Rhegium 196, 198, 199, 201–2, 370
 Rhodes 36, 82 n. 19
 Romulus 107, 231, 236, 239–41, 243, 247–9, 252–4, 265, 326
 Roscii 67, 303
 Roscius, Sex. (father) 79–92, 305, 313, 344–6
 Roscius, Sex. (Cicero's client) 61, 64, 67, 70, 77, 79–118, 305, 315, 344–6
 Rubico 273, 284
 Rupilius, P. (*cos.* 132 BC) 41
 Rupilius Rex, P. 221 n. 66
 Rutilius Rufus, P. (*cos.* 105 BC) 20 n. 20
 Sabinum 118, 138, 174, 220, 272, 273, 275, 280, 281, 286, 289, 291, 294, 295, 299, 300, 301, 311, 318, 319, 320, 322, 323, 324, 327, 329
 Saepinum 121
 Salarius 305
 Sallustius Crispus, C. 4, 6, 7, 12 n. 34, 13, 57, 60, 71, 78, 96, 97, 102, 104, 106–8, 111, 112, 114, 118, 119, 122, 123, 126, 128–36, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 144, 148, 149, 150, 152, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158–61, 162–8, 169, 171, 172, 173–81, 185, 239, 342, 346, 348–54, 359, 360–6
 Saloniae 212, 213, 226–7
 Saloninus (son of Gallienus) 213
saltus Marcus 46
 Samnites 52, 57, 274, 275, 278, 280, 283, 286, 292, 296, 300, 304
 Samnium 121, 210, 297, 306, 310, 328
 Santa Maria di Falleri 298
 Sardinia 96, 109
 Sarsina 272, 276, 277, 281, 296, 297, 302, 311, 313

- Saserna 209
 Satrius Rufus, Cn. 308
 Scato 114–15, 320, 350
 Scheggia Pass 282–4, 297
 Schultz, F. 8
 Scirtones 116
 Scirtus 114, 116, 118, 119, 350
 Scribonius Curio, C. (*cos.* 76 BC) 75, 94, 102, 104, 112, 146
 Scullard, H. H. 5, 339, 340, 341
 Secession War 13
 Seius, M. 120
 Sempronia (in Sallust's BC) 6, 104, 112, 134, 173–81, 353, 363–6
 Sempronia (sister of the Gracchi) 24, 175
 Sempronia (Decimus Brutus' wife) 96, 134, 177–8
 Sempronia (granddaughter of *cos.* 129 BC) 135, 176–8, 181, 183, 185
 Sempronia Atratina 136
 Sempronii 29, 43, 103, 176, 177, 180, 182, 303
 Sempronii Atratini 135
 Sempronius Atratinus, L. (*cos. suff.* 34 BC) 131, 177 n. 29, 182 n. 1, 353, 354
 Sempronius Gracchus, C. (*tr. pl.* 123, 122 BC) 41, 50–1, 103, 175, 176, 182, 183, 363, 364, 366
 Sempronius Gracchus, T. (*cos.* 215, 213 BC) 28, 29, 34
 Sempronius Gracchus, T. (*cos.* 177, 163 BC) 17 n. 4, 33, 37, 43, 49
 Sempronius Gracchus, T. (*tr. pl.* 133 BC) 23, 24, 38, 39–40, 41–2, 182, 321
 Sempronius Tuditanus, M. (*cos.* 240 BC) 29
 Sempronius Tuditanus, C. (*cos.* 129 BC) 29 n. 27, 41, 175–6, 180, 182, 227, 363, 373
 Sempronius Tuditanus, C. (son of *cos.* 129 BC) 135, 176–7, 178, 181, 183
 Sempronius Tuditanus, M. (*cos.* 185 BC) 29, 31–2, 45
 Sempronius Tuditanus, P. (*cos.* 204 BC, *cens.* 210 BC) 29
 Sena Gallica 283, 284
 Senate (Roman) 20, 24, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 41, 47–50, 55, 57, 60, 67, 69, 70, 71, 74, 77, 85, 94, 97, 101, 102, 104, 109, 115, 132, 136, 141, 144, 147, 149, 150, 152, 158, 162, 163, 164, 171, 174, 185, 195, 196, 197, 201, 204, 208, 217, 230, 236, 240, 248, 252, 257, 258, 262, 263, 270, 291, 303, 313, 314, 317, 318, 325, 327, 328, 331, 332, 333, 335, 341, 344, 346, 347, 359, 361, 366, 381
senatus consultum ultimum 94 n. 3, 163
 Sentinum 274, 277, 278, 282, 283, 284, 297, 307, 379
 Septempeda 283
 Sergius Catilina, L. 6, 95, 104, 107, 108, 114, 128, 129, 132–5, 138, 140, 141, 143, 150–9, 161–3, 166, 167, 169–71, 173–5, 179, 180, 183–5, 188, 208, 243, 306, 347, 355, 356, 357, 358–9, 360, 361, 364, 365, 366
 Serranus, A. (*cos.* 106 BC) 79
 Sertorius, Q. 112, 116–18, 119, 120, 122, 124, 348, 350, 351
 Servilia 101, 102, 103, 174, 185
 Servilii 23 n. 45
 Servilius, C. (*pr.* 102 BC) 147
 Servilius, Cn. 284, 285
 Servilius Caepio, Cn. (*cos.* 169 BC) 21, 22, 36, 47, 48
 Servilius Caepio, Q. (*cos.* 140 BC) 50 n. 36
 Servilius Caepio, Q. (*pr.* 91 BC) 101, 177
 Servilius Casca Longus, P. 132
 Servilius Geminus, C. 342
 Servilius Glaucia, C. (*pr.* 100 BC) 94
 Servilius Isauricus, P. (*cos.* 48 BC) 207, 208
 Servilius Rullus, P. (*tr. pl.* 63 BC) 186
 Servilius Vatia Isauricus, P. (*cos.* 79 BC) 61, 62, 67, 70, 73, 74, 75, 78, 83 n. 27, 87, 88, 94, 95, 105, 147, 187
 Servilius Vatia Isauricus, P. (*cos.* 48 BC) 102, 203, 208, 372
 Servius Tullius 55
 Sestius, P. (q. 63 BC, *tr. pl.* 57 BC) 130, 168
 Shakespeare, W. 11 n. 30, 12
 Sibylline Books 49–50
 Sicily 39, 40, 57, 67, 68, 70–2, 74, 87, 95, 100, 118, 144, 170, 198, 317, 334, 335, 360
 Social War 13, 85, 86, 88, 93, 94, 105, 112, 115, 141, 210, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 300, 304, 310, 315, 320, 346, 380
 Spain 40, 60, 67, 68, 70, 71, 81, 83, 86, 95, 111, 112, 117, 119, 123–7, 146, 151, 152, 158, 162, 170, 193, 199, 217, 218, 251, 314, 323, 329, 330, 334, 335, 344, 350, 356, 359
 Spolegium 9, 273, 274, 282, 284, 286–93, 297, 298, 299, 303, 304, 305, 308, 310, 311, 313–20, 322, 323, 329, 332, 334, 335, 345, 356, 378, 379, 380, 382
 Spoleto, Duchy of 286
 Staienus, C. 317
 Staius Murcus, L. (*pr.* 45 BC) 327, 328, 381
 Statilius, L. 166–7
 Statilius, Marius 318
 Statilius Taurus, T. 54, 75, 266, 318, 323, 329, 333–5
 Statius 274
 Staveley, E. V. 8–9, 375, 377
 Stoeni 51
 Subura 194
 Sulmo 329 n. 251

- Sulpicia 28
 Sulpicius, C. (*pr.* 211 BC) 28 n. 22
 Sulpicius Galba, P. (*cos.* 211 BC) 28 n. 22
 Sulpicius Galba, P. (*cos. cand.* 64 BC) 113, 145, 162
 Sulpicius Galba, Ser. (*cos.* 144 BC) 37, 42, 337
 Sulpicius Galus 28 n. 22
 Sulpicius Paternulus, Ser. 28 n. 22
 Sulpicius Rufus, Ser. (*cos.* 51 BC) 142, 163, 174, 177, 221
 Sutrium 277–8, 316
 Syria 36, 381
 Syrian Gates 293

 Tacitus 4, 6, 13, 64, 108, 119, 173, 263, 264, 266, 270, 271, 289, 326, 336, 363
 Tadinates 273
 Tadinum 282, 283, 284, 297
 Tarentum 69, 229, 334
 Tariona 116
 Tarquinius 163, 164
 Tarula 114, 116, 118, 119, 349
 Taylor, L. R. 7, 366
 Tellus 196
 Terence 116
 Terentius Varro, C. (*cos.* 216 BC) 16
 Teretina (tribe) 319
 Thapsus 242
 Theresienstadt/Terezín 5
 Thermus 143
 Thrace 116, 117, 118, 265
 Tiberius Caesar Augustus 55, 127, 172, 269, 270, 337, 345, 377
 Tiber 231, 273, 275, 280, 281, 292, 293, 296, 305, 311, 345, 377
 Tibur 13 n. 36, 20 n. 21, 42, n. 117, 113
 Timavus 226 n. 93, 227
 Tingi 122, 123, 124, 126
 Tinis 282
 Tiresias 237
 Titinia 315–16
 Titinius 315–16
 Tityrus 214, 224 n. 84, 228
 Transalpine Gaul 82, 118, 160
 Trasimene, Battle of 276, 284, 285, 290, 301
 Trebia/Trevi 286, 288, 289, 297
 Trebonius, C. 11 n. 30, 332
 Trebula Mutuesca 295
 Treia 283
 tribes 138, 139, 186, 276, 294, 296–7, 300, 301, 303, 311, 318, 319, 369
tribunicia potestas 269–70
 Trinity College, Oxford 13
 triumph 17, 22, 27, 31, 33, 37, 47, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 82, 86 n. 53, 93, 101, 116, 124, 132, 136, 146, 158, 187, 212, 215, 216, 225, 227–8, 231, 233, 234, 235, 236 n. 23, 243, 250–1, 253, 259, 264, 265, 269, 270, 278, 280, 281, 302, 305, 309, 323, 328, 335–6, 344, 345, 357, 379
 Triumvirs 11 n. 28, 100, 114, 119, 136, 172, 179, 184, 203, 210, 217–18, 220, 221, 225, 246, 252, 260, 262–3, 265, 266, 271, 306–7, 308, 314, 320, 322, 376, 381
 Troy 231, 235–6, 245–6, 247, 248, 249, 252, 253, 273, 275, 326
 Truentum 282
 Tuder 273–5, 276, 279, 282, 286, 288, 289, 292, 294, 296, 297, 303, 304, 308, 313, 379
 Tuficum 275, 282, 283, 284, 311
 Tullius Cicero, L. 137, 355
 Tullius Cicero, M. (*cos.* 63 BC) 5, 7, 10 n. 24, 12 n. 34, 16, 17, 27, 61, 62–4, 65, 76, 79–92, 94, 95, 98, 99, 104, 111, 112, 114–15, 116, 117, 118, 120, 124, 128–34, 136, 137–9, 140, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148–56, 159–73, 175, 177–81, 183, 184, 186, 189, 196–205, 207, 208, 210, 211, 217, 218, 239, 240, 256, 257, 259, 260, 261, 271, 275, 276, 293, 294, 305, 310, 315, 316, 317, 319, 327, 328, 332, 333, 344, 345, 349, 350, 352, 353, 355, 357, 359, 360, 361, 364, 365, 370, 371, 381
 Tullius Cicero, Q. (*pr.* 62 BC) 53 n. 63, 106, 139
 Tullius Decula, M. 58
 Turia (river) 170
 Turiaso 127
 Tusculum 26, 27, 180, 349

 Ulia 125
 Umbrenus, P. 166, 167
 Umbria 2, 4, 9, 10, 11, 125 n. 25, 139, 220, 272–338, 345, 378–82
 Ummidii 319
 Ummidius Durmius Quadratus, C. 319
 Urvinum 275

 Valeria (Sulla's wife) 66 n. 52, 75, 89, 96 n. 14, 155, 169, 346, 362
 Valeria, Paulla 156
 Valerius Dasius, C. 116
 Valerius Fenestella, C. 81, 126–7, 345, 351, 352
 Valerius Flaccus, C. (*pr.* 183 BC) 192
 Valerius Flaccus, C. (*cos.* 93 BC) 57, 82, 88, 192, 345
 Valerius Flaccus, L. (*cos.* 195 BC) 16 n. 2, 19, 30
 Valerius Flaccus, L. (*cos.* 152 BC) 38
 Valerius Flaccus, L. (*cos.* 131 BC) 192
 Valerius Flaccus, L. (*cos.* 100 BC, *interrex* 82 BC) 57, 93

- Valerius Flaccus, L. (*cos. suff.* 86 BC) 98
 Valerius Laevinus, M. (*pr.* 215 BC, *cos.* 210 BC) 28–9, 30
 Valerius Laevinus, M. (*pr.* 182 BC) 37
 Valerius Laevinus, C. (*cos. suff.* 176 BC) 33, 37
 Valerius Laevinus, P. 37 n. 84
 Valerius Leo 75
 Valerius Martialis, M. 126
 Valerius Messalla, M'. (*cos.* 161 BC) 88 n. 68
 Valerius Messalla Corvinus, M. (*cos.* 31 BC) 234 n. 13, 266 n. 31, 334, 378, 381
 Valerius Messalla Niger, M. (*cos.* 61 BC) 87–8, 89, 90, 100, 142, 155
 Valerius Messalla, Potitus (*cos. suff.* 29 BC) 155 n. 10, 264
 Valerius Messalla Rufus, M. (*cos.* 53 BC) 87, 142, 155, 169, 171, 256, 362
 Valerius Orca, Q. 217
 Valerius Poplicola, P. (*cos.* iv) 259
 Vandal War 286
 Varenus, C. 305
 Varenus, Cn. 305
 Varenus, L. 305, 315
 Varenus Mevanas 276
 Vargunteius, L. 151, 158, 166, 167, 361
 Varius Rufus, L. 212, 229
 Vatinius, P. (*cos.* 47 BC) 117, 164, 170
 Vedius Pollio, P. 90
 Veienus 319
 Veii 247
 Velia 190, 198, 200 n. 14, 202, 204, 205, 370
 Velina, tribe 21 n. 21, 300, 301
 Velitrae 210
 Ventidius Bassus, P. 265, 291–2, 320, 327–30, 332, 380, 381
 Venuleius Pataccius, L. 125 n. 25
 Venus 235, 247
 Venusia 286, 290, 307 n. 134
 Vergilius Maro, P. 4, 8, 12 n. 34, 55, 80, 212–54, 275, 276, 309, 326, 332, 372–4
 Verres, C. 98, 100, 118, 143, 144, 146, 160
 Vesidius Receptus, L. 319 n. 194
Vespasiae 289
 Vesta 159, 160, 161, 192, 231, 236
 Vestal Virgins 6, 51, 59 n. 17, 158–61, 165, 192, 260, 261, 264, 358–9
 Vestini 300, 329 n. 254
 veterans 56, 62, 67, 107, 109, 160, 170, 201, 217, 252, 291, 304, 307, 308
 Vettius, L. 114, 116, 168, 349
 Vettius Scato, P. 114–15, 320
 Veturius Philo, L. (*cos.* 206 BC) 18
via Ameria 288
via Appia 75, 147, 282
via Egnatia 293
via Flaminia 9, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286–9, 292, 293, 294, 297, 298, 299, 306, 310, 312, 313, 378, 379
via Latina 335, 336
via Salaria 280, 289
 Vibius, Sex. 211 n. 31
 Vibius Capax, C. 211 n. 31
 Vibius Habitus, A. (*cos. suff.* AD 8) 211
 Vibius Paciaecus, L. 124–5, 352
 Vibius Pansa Caetronianus, C. (*cos.* 43 BC) 199, 207, 208, 217 n. 36, 333
 Vibius Postumus, C. (*cos. suff.* AD 5) 211 n. 31
 Vibusius 319
 Vicarello 287
Vicus Martis 289
Vicus Matrini 316
 Vindonissa 337
 Vipsanius Agrippa, M. 75, 209, 211, 263, 264, 265–6, 291, 318, 322, 323, 327, 331, 334
Virtus 85, 88, 165, 173, 245, 321
 Visellius Aculeo, C. 138
 Visellius Varro, C. 138, 355
 Visidius 307
 Visidius, L. 319
 Vitellius 287
 Vitellius, L. 324 n. 220
 Vitulsius Nepos, Sex. (*cos. suff.* AD 78) 329 n. 254, 330 n. 269
 Volaterrae 57, 279, 310, 315, 316, 333
 Volcarius Tullus, L. (*cos.* 66 BC) 114, 140, 149, 150
 Volceii 318, 329
 Volsinii 300
 Volumnius, P. 115
 Volumnius Eutrapelus, P. 115
 Volusianus 290
 Vulci 300
 Wolfson College, Oxford 2, 13
 Zeus 233 n. 9

Primary Sources

Aeschylus
F196 Nauck 72 n. 95

Appian
BC

1.2 328
1.19 176, 315
1.36 304, 315
1.37 135
1.39 290
1.40 88
1.49 291
1.50 210
1.79 193, 349
1.89–90 304
1.90 291
1.94 95, 112
1.98 70
1.99 57
1.103 56, 60, 61, 63
1.105 108
1.107 109
2.3 129
2.92 171
2.99 53
2.104 324
2.135–6 202
3.11 206 n. 2
3.28–9 204
3.28 204
3.31 202
3.50 202
3.54–61 202
3.60 210
3.75 208
4.2 381
4.3 307
4.7 263
4.24 184
5.3 217
5.23 307
5.30 307
5.31 217
5.33 291, 292
5.49 307
5.50 292
5.60 210
5.75 227 n. 99
5.80–8 323

5.96 323
5.97 334
5.102 323
5.132 233, 335

Hann.

9 285

Iber.

11 285

80 39, 95, 103, 176

Mithr.

116 73

Apuleius

Apol.

66.4 104

Asconius

10.19–22 156, 213

15.14 99

27 190

30.8–9 165

35.7–8 178

35.40 177

37.18–21 181

38.23–39.1 184

40.18–21 135, 181

40.19 178

45.27–46.4 159

46.5–6 159

49.6–8 181

49.22 131

49.24–50.2 181

54.14–16 184

59.14–60.8 317

59.16–17 151

60.9–18 151

60.20 149

61.24–62.2 317

63.6–64.10 104

63.19–21 104

75.7–9 151, 158

79–80 190

82.3–8 162

82.7–15 144

82.9 144, 360

82.13 144

82.14 144

83.15–18 163

88.16–18 158

89.8–12	140	36.44.3	169
89.9–12	150	37.21.4	186
91.1–2	159	37.25.3–4	186
91.1–3	190	37.27	256
91.20–2	159	37.23.3	189
91.24–92.1	156	37.27.2	189
91.24–6	155	37.30.3	185
92.20–5	152	37.37.1	186 n. 6
		37.37.1–2	188, 368
pseudo-Asconius		37.38.2	129 n. 7
206 Or. = 259.1–3 Stangl	67,	37.39.3	185
68, 87		39.10.2–3	132, 179
Augustus		39.60.1	164
<i>Res gestae</i>		40.63.5	102
1–2	326	41.14.5	187 n. 7
10	188	42.51.3–4	369
10.2	181, 369	42.51.4	194
16.1	308	42.53.1–2	171
34	325	43.9.2	180
34.1	264	43.23.5	184
34.3	264, 377	43.24.4	191
		43.51.4–5	320, 328
<i>Bellum Africum</i>		44.5.3	195
8.3	171	44.14.3	177
34.1–2	171	45.3	206
86	171	45.6.2–3	202
97.1	171	45.7.1	22 n. 43, 202
<i>Bellum Alexandrinum</i>		45.8.2	204
53.1	117	45.15.4	201
<i>Bellum Hispaniense</i>		45.47.4	180 n. 55, 183
3.4	125	n. 9	
Caesar		46.7.1	180 n. 55
<i>BC</i>		46.28.1	180 n. 55
1.12	306	46.34	322
1.15	306	46.35.4	318
1.24.3	125	46.56.3	203 n. 30
3.15–16	327	47.7.6	210
3.34.2	327	47.19.2	238
3.62.4	184 n. 19	48.5.4	325
3.83.1	187	48.12.5	217, 218
3.89.3	171	48.13.4–6	307
3.91.2	318	48.14.5–6	307
<i>BG</i>		48.41.7	116, 227, 329
6.1	217	48.46.5–48.2	323
7.1	217	48.54.7	323
Cassius Dio		49.18.4	336
F 33	300	50.6.3	235
36.3.4	156	51.4.6	308
36.15.1	148	51.20.5	323 n. 213, 335
36.39.1	149	51.24.4	72
36.40.3–4	145	52.34.2	238 n. 29
36.41.2	148	52.46.4	238 n. 29
36.44.3–5	152	53.1.1	263, 264, 376, 377
		53.16.7	239, 326
		53.26.1	329
		54.10.5	268, 375

Cassius Dio (<i>cont.</i>)	14.10.3	209	
54.11.6	265	14.11.2	209
54.23	90	14.17.3	208
54.25.3	269	14.17.6	132
54.27.2	188	14.17a.3	208
		14.20.3	200 n. 16
Cato the Elder	15.2.3	209	
F 49 Peter	273, 274	15.11	198
		15.11.1	200
Catullus	15.17.2	171, 210	
10.1	222	15.27.1	199
22.1	222	15.29.1	199
30.1	222	16.1.4	199
61.16	125	16.3	199
61.32–33	125	16.3.4	199
		16.4.1	199
Cicero	16.5.3	199	
<i>Acad.</i>	16.7	196, 370	
2.89	177, 183 n. 10	16.7.1	197, 200, 201, 370
<i>Arch.</i>		16.7.2	198
7	60 n. 19	16.7.5	201, 202
8	304	16.7.7	202, 205
<i>Att.</i>		16.8.2	333
1.1	143	16.11.3–4	132
1.1.1	143, 151	<i>Balb.</i>	
1.2.1	151	28	51
1.4.2	151	45	56
1.7.11	163	46	303
2.1.9	157	48–9	290, 303
2.6.2	132 n. 37	48	316
2.7.3	163	53–4	20
2.12.1	194	<i>Brut.</i>	
2.24.2	114	52	163
4.3.3	171	79	38
4.5.2	320, 349	81	39
4.18.3	167, 184	106	95
5.12.2	171	112	120
6.1.15	320	166	52
6.6.2	99	168	137
7.15.2	317	175	111
8.3.3	194	178	256
8.15.3	257	212–13	88
9.9.1	99	217	315
9.15.2	94	223	144
10.8a.2	131	227	98
11.6.2	260	230	158
11.8.2	167 n. 11	236	158
11.21.2	171	237	143
11.22.2	171	241	158, 161
12.2.1	124, 201, 203	242	317, 329
12.19.3	217	264	138
12.22.3	331	269	99
12.27.3	217	271	310, 317
13.6.4	176	293	148
14.3.3–4	184	305	75
14.6.1	207	328	171

<i>Caec.</i>		1.9.20	164
97	315	4.6	93
<i>Cael.</i>		5.9.2	117
1	131	5.9.3	117
7	131	5.9.7	129 n. 7
26	130, 131	5.11.2	170
60	85	5.18.1	139
<i>Cat.</i>		6.8.9	317
1.4	94	6.12.3	56
1.14	155	6.18.2	124
1.18	151		n. 16, 125
3.9	158, 167	7.5.2	120
3.10	129	8.2.1	88, 171
3.14	167	8.4.1	88, 171
3.15	166	8.7.2	156
3.16	167 n. 7	8.9	257
4.13	182	8.13.2	99
<i>Cat. mai.</i>		9.4.3	208
10–12	28	9.10.3	171
<i>Clu.</i>		10.25.5	333
21	304	10.26.3	333
25	211 n. 31	10.32	218
110	147	11.3	205
165	211 n. 31	11.7.1	177
198	115	12.2	208
<i>Corn.</i>		12.2.1	124, 201, 203
F 10	151	12.2.3	208
F 12	151	12.18.2	132
<i>De or.</i>		12.22.2	112, 177
2.2	137, 138	12.22.3	331
2.12	38, 182	12.25.1	327, 333
2.124	51	12.25.1–2	331, 333
2.262	138	13.5	217
3.3.12	98	13.7.1	217
<i>Div.</i>		13.11.1	113, 139
1.4	85	13.11.12	120
1.72	95	13.52	53 n. 64
2.94	85	13.73–74	54
<i>Dom.</i>		13.77	117
7	85	15.5.1	139
35	157	15.17.1	139
55	357	15.17.2	171, 210
84	50, 320	15.20.1	332
114	38, 182	15.20.4	139
116	115	<i>Fin.</i>	
118	178	5.54	157
134	178	<i>Flacc.</i>	
136	50	46	184
139	178	49	137
<i>Ep. M. Br.</i>		<i>Font.</i>	
1.15.7	203	46–7	359
1.17.4	211	47	160
<i>Fam.</i>		<i>Har. Resp.</i>	
1.1.3	149	12	113, 115
1.2.1–2	149	12	148
1.4.1	149	19	191

<i>Har. Resp. (cont.)</i>	11.11	130, 132
37	193	
45	85	
<i>In Pis.</i>	11.36	54
6	76 n. 121	12.2-3 332
<i>Leg.</i>	12.10	217
3.36	137, 138, 354	12.11.27 95
<i>Leg. agr.</i>	12.15	202
2.6	186	12.27 115
2.18	186	13.24 252
2.80	304	13.25 175
<i>Ad M. Brut.</i>	13.26-9	332
1.17.1	132	13.26 130 n. 19, 132 n. 36
<i>Man.</i>	13.27	132
57-8	151	13.42 325
61	71	13.46 325
<i>Mil.</i>		<i>Pis.</i>
47	131	86 120
75	317	<i>Planc.</i>
<i>Mur.</i>		19 26
50-1	360	27 144
73	160, 178	51 52, 58, 149
81	129, 353	69 68 n. 67, 86
<i>ND</i>		<i>Prov. cons.</i>
2.10-12	49	20 19, 32
<i>Off.</i>		<i>Q. fr.</i>
2.29	115	1.2.13 53 n. 63
2.51	91	2.3.6 130
2.58	105, 112	3.1.3 120
2.73	52	3.1.4 355
3.69	138	3.3.2 170
<i>Or.</i>		<i>Quinct.</i>
108	91	1 88
<i>Part.</i>		24 82
5.40	256	28 82
<i>Phil.</i>		29 82
1.8	199	30 82
1.9	198, 370	31 58
1.10	201	42 82
1.14	201	67 82
2.14	208	<i>Rab. perd.</i>
2.48	178	2-3 189
2.90	177, 183, 200 n. 12	13 189
2.108	63	21 94, 111
2.113	200 n. 12	27-9 189
3.16	177	<i>Rab. Post.</i>
3.26	327, 331, 332, 381	7 171
3.37-9	333	<i>Rep.</i>
4.9	257	1.34 63
5.2-5	333	2.15-19 240
5.17	63	2.55 259, 271
5.19	201	2.175 138
5.28	333	6.12 63
5.50	325	<i>Rosc. Am.</i>
10.8	200 n. 12	1-2 84, 85, 86
11.10-15	332	11 83
		15 67

15–16	84	68.4	356
20	305	71	161
22	90	72.4	171
27	84, 305	81	151, 152
35	315	91	150
38	315	92	151
39	315	<i>Tusc.</i>	
42	315	5.112	157
44	315	<i>Verr.</i>	
50	315	1.7	146
52	315	1.10	146
55	315	1.15	146
58	315	2.1.143	98
61	315	2.3.81	63
62	315	2.3.212	95
69	41		
72	315	<i>Comm. Pet.</i>	
73	41, 315	13	106
77	84		
78–80	315	<i>Digest</i>	
82–3	315	1.2.2.44	221
82	84	5.1.76	220
89–90	315	Diodorus Siculus	
91	315	20.44	279
96	51	34–35.2.18	42
101	315	37.2.10	112
104	315		
122	315	Dionysius of Halicarnassus	
127	315	<i>Ant. Rom.</i>	
128	59, 83	4.8.3	55
131	63		
132	315	Donatus	
133–5	91	10	213
135–42	64	25	225
139	61	63	213, 215
147	85, 305		
149	64, 87, 90, 91	Ennius	
<i>Sest.</i>		<i>Ann.</i> , ed. Skutsch	
7	94	137	55
9	168		
11	130, 352	<i>Epitome de Caesaribus</i>	
72	130	12.1	319
		31.2–4	290
<i>Sull.</i>			
6–7	129, 167	Eutropius	
6	59, 151, 361	5.3.2	210 n. 30
15–16	169	6.1.1	65
17	170		
19	168	Festus, ed. Lindsay	
20.1	169	268.8–13	274, 302
31	130	462/464	193 n. 58
42	87		
51–2	140	Firmicus Maternus	
53	170	<i>Math.</i>	
62	170	1.7.28	52 n. 59
65	171		
67	169	Florus	
		2.9.27–8	291

- Florus (*cont.*)
 2.9.27 305
 2.11.1 78
 2.34.66 239
- Frontinus
Aq.
 1.6 27
 1.7 49
 1.7.5 342
Strat.
 4.5.1 67, 73, 344
- Gellius
 2.15.4–7 260
 12.2.2–4 172
 13.15 256
 15.4 328
 15.4.1 88
 15.4.3 320, 327
 15.28.3 70, 79
 15.28.4 81
 15.28.4–5 81
 15.28.6 80
 17.21.44 24
- Grammatici Latini*, ed. Keil
 1.124.5 224
 1.208–20 50
 2.112.20 315
 2.270.5 191
 2.380.3 191
 7.14.70 294
- Granius Licinianus,
 ed. Flemisch
 p. 31.1–3 86
 p. 31.3–32.1 82
 p. 32.14 60, 69
 p. 33.14–34.4 109
 p. 34.8–35.1 109
- Historia Augusta
Claud.
 5.4 120
Gall.
 19.2–3 213
M. Ant. Phil.
 1.6 330
- Horace
Ars Poetica
 438 219
Carm.
 1.2.44 249
 1.12.45–8 250
 1.24 219
 3.3.15 240
- 3.357–60 246
 4.8 55
Epist.
 2.1.5 240
Sat.
 1.2.13 120
 1.3.129–33 221
 1.5.39–44 229
 1.5.48 229
 1.6.54 229
 1.9.18 249
 2.5.62–4 237
 2.6.40 229
- Jerome
Chron., ed. Helm
 150 80
 154 80
 164 80
 165 136, 219
 172 127
- Josephus
AJ
 14.219 115
BJ
 1.284 136
- Julius Obsequens
 51 86
 55 85
- Lactantius
Div. Inst.
 3.23 177, 183
- Livy
 1.16.3 239, 326
 1.16.4 240
 2.1 259
 5.49.7 247
 8.11.16 299
 8.14.10 299
 8.40 278
 9.32 277
 9.32–3 278
 9.35 278
 9.35–7 277
 9.36.1 279
 9.36.2–9 281
 9.37 277
 9.37.12 277, 279
 9.41 278
 9.41.8 279
 9.41.8–20 284
 9.41.13–20 278
 9.41.15 274

9.41.16	281	35.24.4	31
9.41.20	281	36.45.9	30 n. 38
10.1.6–8	278	37.2.6	30 n. 38
10.3.2	274, 302	37.43.1	95
10.5.13	302	37.47.8	42 n. 118
10.9.8–10.5	274	37.51.1–2	192
10.9–10	278	38.9.8	29
10.9.8–9	280	38.35.2	48 n. 27
10.10.5	278, 293	38.43.1–44.6	45
10.10.12	280	38.43.1–6	31
10.12.3–8	279	38.43.1–4	18
10.25.5	333	38.43.1	18, 32
10.25.11	279	38.43.7–44.3	31
10.26.3	333	38.44.11–45.2	18
10.27.2	277, 278	38.45.1–49	31
10.36.14	280	39.20.1–10	21
10.45.6	298	39.20.5–10	46
22.8–9	285	39.23.2	45, 48 n. 27
22.9.1–2	290	39.32–3	19
22.42.4–6	329	39.32.6	19
23.31.13–14	28	39.35.2	46 n. 11
24.1–31.15	274	39.39.1–15	192
24.7.12–25.8	28	39.40–1	176
24.43.5	28	39.44.10	38
25.2.1	17 n. 4	39.46.1–2	23
25.5.2–4	186 n. 5	39.52.1	20
25.41.11	28	39.56.5	37
25.41.12	28 n. 22	40.1.1–2	37 n. 84
26.2.7–16	30	40.1.4	37 n. 84
26.3	30	40.1.7	37 n. 84
26.5.8	30	40.3.1	46
26.14.6	30	40.17.8	20
26.15–16	28	40.37.5–7	32
26.15.4	28	40.37.6	19
26.16.4	28	40.41.8–11	32
26.23.1	30	40.42.8–13	192
27.1.12	28, 30	40.42.11	37
27.6.2–11	29	40.42.12	46
27.6.16	44	40.45.6–46	32
27.8.4	192	40.45.7–46.16	46
27.8.10	30	40.46.14	18 n. 10
27.9.7–10.10	290	40.51.1	32
28.45.2–6	30	40.51.2	99
28.45.20	303	41.15.9–10	35
30.25.2	20	42.1.7–12	35
31.4.3	30	42.3.1–11	35
31.50.4	37	42.8–10	35
31.50.6–10	192	42.10.4	35
32.2.6–7	289	42.22–3	35
32.7.8	30	42.28.11–12	35
32.7.14	192	42.32.1–4	47, 48 n. 27
32.12.6–7	20	42.38.1	47, 48 n. 27
32.28.3	30	42.38.8	47
34.15.19	91	42.47.9	47
35.10.2	31	42.49	259
35.10.11	30	43.1.4–11	36

Livy (*cont.*)

- 43.1.12 37 n. 82
- 43.11.2 37 n. 82
- 43.11.9–11 37 n. 82
- 43.14.1 37
- 43.15.3 49
- 43.18.10 290
- 43.19.7 290
- 44.1–2 48 n. 27, 50
- 44.3.2 48 n. 27, 50
- 44.17.1–4 48
- 44.35.14 22
- 44.36.9 22
- 44.40.3 22
- 44.41.2 36
- 45.7.1 22
- 45.10.8–10 36
- 45.12.5–6 36
- 45.16.3 37
- 45.17.2 37
- 45.35.5–39 22
- 45.35.8–11 37
- 45.40 93
- 45.41.11 93 n. 2
- 45.43.9–10 290
- 45.44.3 37 n. 87
- 46.10–15 298

Epit. Oxyrh.

- 113 37
- 188–9 49

Per.

- 12 187
- 19 192
- 19.10 300, 301
- 20 274
- 20.2 282, 286, 293
- 20.12 293
- 43 24, 45
- 47 192
- 59 176
- 67 190
- 73 329
- 76.6 105, 112
- 89 65, 70
- 90 57
- 90.3 109
- 98 184

Lucan

- 1.45–55 234
- 2.327–49 54

Lucretius

- 3.1025 55
- 5.1234 258

Macrobius

Sat.

- 1.11.22 218
- 1.12.24 115
- 1.16.29 191
- 2.2.9 184
- 2.3.9 76
- 2.4.18 253
- 2.5.10 161
- 3.11.3 113
- 3.13.11 115, 193
- 6.1.29 244 n. 55
- 6.6.1 212

Memnon of Heraclea

- 39.3–4 145
- 53 53 n. 63

Nicolaus of

Damascus

- 7.16 209
- 18.55 206
- 23.96 206
- 26.96 324
- 27.106 207
- 28.110 203, 207
- 28.111 204, 371
- 29 204
- 31.133 371

Nonius, ed. Lindsay

- 95 304
- 189 304

Orosius

- 5.4.19 95
- 5.12.7 176
- 5.18.23 210
- 5.21.1 61
- 5.21.3 94, 119
- 5.22.7 177 n. 29
- 5.22.17 96
- 5.23.12 68 n. 68, 170
- 6.2.16 113
- 6.3.1 159
- 6.6.7 114, 168
- 6.13.3 158

Ovid

Fasti

- 2.60 253 n. 87
- 2.141–2 254
- 3.419–22 187

Met.

- 15.745–61 250–1

Pliny the Elder

Nat.

2.94 202, 230
 3.51 300
 3.110 280
 3.112–14 275
 3.113 273, 284, 294
 3.114 273, 274,
 285, 297
 3.143 116, 117
 7.98 72
 7.135 328
 7.136 27
 7.137 63
 7.156 58, 98, 187
 7.158 83 n. 30
 11.190 291, 318
 21.6 187
 27.54 135
 33.21 120
 33.146 127
 35.13 100
 36.49 100
 36.109 100
 37.13 72

Pliny the Younger

Ep.

1.4.1 313
 3.19.7 313
 5.7.4 313

Pan.

43.3 254

Plutarch

Aem.

3 21
 5 17, 18
 6 21
 10 22
 15–18 22
 17 21
 20.1–3 302
 21 22
 22 22
 30–2 22
 35 17
 35.1–2 93
 35.1 94
 37 22
 38 22

Ant.

16 204
 16.1 202
 24 54

58.5–6 335

Apophth. Cn. Pompei

5a 69, 73 n. 101

Brut.

27 210

C. Gracch.

8 41, 176

Caes.

1–2 184

1.1 97

5 75

7 187

9.3 51

17 75

Cato

7.9 113

Cat. Min.

7.1–2 157

19 159

19.3 358

25 53

39 53

Cic.

1.1 97

9.1–2 151

9.6 151

18 129

23 129

29 76

Comp. Lys. Sull.

2.4 58, 72

Cor.

11 87

Crass.

1 159

4 124, 125, 127

5 81, 127

6 90

6.5 274, 304

7 76

8.1 147

12 165

13 163

24 177

25 53

28 158

32 124

Fab. Max.

19.1–4 27 n. 11

Inimic. util.

6 159

Luc.

5–6 256

6.2–4 161

42.2–5 104

- Mar.*
 6.2 98
 38.3–5 316
- Marc.*
 9.4–7 27
- Pomp.*
 1 72 n. 95
 4 135
 4.1–3 99
 5 155
 9 59, 112, 357
 9.2–3 148
 11 68
 12 71
 13 71
 13.4 71
 14 67, 69, 73
 14.3 72
 15 74, 76, 104
 15.1–16.1 93
 15.2–3 72
 15.2 76
 16 76
 16.1–2 109
 16.6 96
 18 193
 22.3 147
- Rom.*
 27 240
- Sert.*
 9–10 122, 123
 9 124
 12.3–4 119, 350
 21.1 68
 22 193
 43.44 117
- Sull.*
 2 90
 5 52
 6 59, 66, 151
 6.5 60
 10.3 61
 29 58
 33 59
 33.3 155
 33.4 98
 34 57, 61, 74, 76, 77, 342
 34.4–5 104
 34.4 76, 93
 34.5 76 n. 121
 35 66, 75, 89, 155, 169
 35.4 362
 36 90
 38.1 72
- Tib. Gracch.*
 8 40
- 11 40
 14 40 n. 102
 21 176 n. 14
- Polybius
 3.86 285
 3.86.9 286
 3.87.7 262
 21.29.10–11 29
 28.13.7–9 48
 28.17.1–12 48
 29.25.2 48
 29.25.5 48
 31.26.9 25
- Porphyrio
AP
 438 219
- Sat.*
 1.3.130 221
- Posidonius,
 ed. Edelstein-Kidd
 F 259–60 27
- Probus
Ecl. Praef.
 p. 327.30 224
- Procopius
Bell. Goth.
 1.16 290
 1.17 290
 2.8 290
 2.11 290
 3.6 290
 3.12 290
 3.23 290
 4.33 290
- Propertius
 1.21 309
 1.22.3 149
 1.22.4 309
 2.34.61–2 248
 3.4.1 251
 3.18.34 250
 3.22.21–2 321
 4.1.45–7 247
 4.1.53–4 247
 4.1.87–8 247
 4.1.121–6 275
 4.1.125–6 275
 4.1.128–31 309
 4.6.21 247
 4.6.59 250

Ptolemy	39.1	149
<i>Geogr.</i>	39.5	167, 180
3.1	40.5	111, 173
	43.1	128, 173
Quintilian	43.2	174
1.5.8	44.2	167
4.1.68	47.4	163, 167
5.13.25	48.5	164
6.3.78	48.7	164, 359
8.3.31	48.9	164
9.3.89	50.4	163
12.6.4	52.5–12	174
	52.19–23	174
Sallust	52.24	174
<i>Cat.</i>	53.6	321
2.3	55.6	174
4.1	59.3	167
5.1	60.6	167
15.1	<i>Hist.</i> , ed. Maurenbrecher	
15.2	1.3	108
15.2–3	1.9–10	108
17.1	1.12	108
17.3–4	1.45	138, 154, 357
17.3	1.55.2–3	106
17.4	1.55.5	239
17.7	1.55.22	119
18–19	1.67	109
18	1.75	75 n. 109, 102
18.1	1.77	97
18.2	1.77.6	101
18.4	1.77.11	112
18.5	1.77.12	114
19	1.77.21	114
19.1	1.86	112
19.2	1.88	119
20.16	1.90	118
21.1	1.108	119
23.2	1.115	69
23.3	2.20	126
23.3–4	2.21	60, 71, 344
24.3	2.42	142
25	2.59	193
25.1	2.82.4	71 n. 87
25.2	3.3	180
26.1	3.5	113
26.2	3.6	113
26.3	3.48.8	150
26.5	4.43	144
27.1	4.51	165, 361
28.2	4.81	148
31.1–2	<i>Jug.</i>	
35	3.3	172
35.1	4.3	180
35.3	4.4–8	180
37.6	40.2	315
38.3	85.5	141

pseudo-Sallust

Inv. Cic.

4 165

4.7 239

Berne Scholiast,

in Lucanum

2.173 138

in Eclogas

3.105 213

8.6 213

Bobbio Scholiast

167.22–30 Stangl 169

Verona Scholiast

Ecl.

7.9 220

Seneca the Elder

*Controv.*10, *praef.* 5 324 n. 221

Seneca

Cons. Marc.

12.6 78

Ep.

27.5–6 354

114.17–21 160

NQ

5.18.4 252

Servius

Aen.

p. 2.8 Thilo 225

1.28–9 191

1.286 212

6.789 212

6.842 212

8.363 195 n. 66

8.657–728 212

Ecl.

p. 3.26 Thilo 225

1.47 213

3.94 213

4.1 212, 236 n. 23

5.20 219

6.6 213 n. 13, 219, 223

6.9 220

6.13 220

6.64 218, 220

8.12 227

9.7 213

9.10 218 n. 46

10.1 229

Georg.

4.1 229

Servius auctus

Ecl.

4.11 213

9.1 213

Silius Italicus

Pun.

6.403 48 n. 27

6.576 48 n. 27

8.459 299

Sisenna

F119 294

Strabo

5.2.10 275, 287, 289, 312

5.3.1 280

7.5.6 117

13.1.55 66 n. 55

Suetonius

Aug.

10.2 202

14–15 307 n. 136

16.4 99

17.2 235

17.3 308

19.1 116

49.1 117

62.1 178, 203

66 90

66.2 331

66.4 331

85.1 253

95.2 318

DJ

1 191

1–2 184

1.1 59, 97, 98

1.2 59

1.3 65, 76

3 102

5 102

6 156

6.1–2 317

6.1 51

9 140, 153

11 317

11.2 190

12 188

17 114, 167

17.2 194

20 260

20.5 116

39.2 184

45.5 76

- 46.1 194
 50.1 144
 72.2 324
 74 51
 77.1 56, 343,
 370
 79.4 246
 83.2 98
 86.1 117
Gramm.
 12 116
Nero
 2.1 186, 190
Tib.
 2.4 19
Vesp.
 1.5 289
Vit.
 3 324

 Tacitus
Ann.
 1.1 64
 1.1.1 271
 1.2.1 266
 1.4 19
 1.5.2 136
 1.9 326
 1.10 64, 326
 2.48.3 172
 3.28 321
 3.28.2 263
 3.28.3 264
 3.76 211
 4.1 173
 4.34 252
 6.11.3 266
 11.6.3 336
 12.41.2 270
Dial.
 39.5 130
Hist.
 1.2 323
 1.49 21
 2.64 289
 2.92–3 156
 3.55.4 287
 3.60 287
 3.63 287
 3.79 289
 3.82 289
 4.13.3 120

 Tertullian
Apol.
 24 307
- Thucydides
 3.82.4 322

 Valerius Maximus
 1.6.13 126
 3.2.14 126
 3.4.5 303
 3.8.3 144, 145, 148
 4.6.5 126
 5.4, ext. 3 123
 5.4.4 145
 5.8.3 184
 5.9.2 88, 89,
 169, 171
 5.10.2 93
 5.10.3 51
 6.2.8 146
 6.7.1 23 n. 45
 7.8.1 177, 183
 8.13.4 98
 8.15.2 28 n. 22
 9.1.5 193
 9.1.8 180, 183
 9.3.2 50
 9.11, ext. 4 126, 127

 Varro
Res Rust.
 3.1.2 239

 Velleius Paterculus
 1.10.3 94
 1.10.3–5 93
 1.14.5 286, 293
 1.14.8 274, 282
 2.10.1 43
 2.11.3 59
 2.14.3 54
 2.17.3 190 n. 34
 2.26.3 135
 2.26.3–4 155
 2.27 169
 2.40.4 186
 2.41.2 60,
 97, 154
 2.43.1 191
 2.43.4 76, 317
 2.53.4 73
 2.62.3 199,
 200 n. 17
 2.69.5 211
 2.74.2 181
 2.74.4 307
 2.85.2 308
 2.102.1 55
 2.127.1 323

Virgil

Aen.

- 1.33 244, 326
 1.242–4 227
 1.286–96 236
 1.286–91 374
 1.286 212, 326
 6.403 244, 326
 6.621–2 244
 6.624 244
 6.756–892 249
 6.756–57 249
 6.780 238
 6.789–805 237–8
 6.789–800 374
 6.789–90 238–9
 6.789 212
 6.815–16 55
 6.826–5 241
 6.842 212
 8.626–731 243
 8.657–728 212
 8.667–70 243
 8.678–81 374
 8.678–9 248
 8.681 248
 8.685 242
 12.189–91 245
 12.821–8 245
 12.834–40 246

Ecl.

- 1.6–10 228
 1.6–8 230
 1.43 228 n. 104
 4.1 212
 6.6–12 216
 6.6 220
 6.10 220
 6.12 220
 6.64 220
 8.6–13 220,
 224, 226
 9.7–10 214
 9.10 216, 218
 9.26–9 220
 9.27–9 216
 9.28 224
 9.27–9 216
 9.35–6 224
 9.47 231

Georg.

- 1.24–42 232
 1.42 236
 1.466–8 231
 1.498–505 231
 1.503–4 233

- 1.510–11 235
 2.170–2 234, 374
 3.16–39 234, 235
 3.27 241
 3.41 228
 3.46–8 248

Catalepton

- 10 328

De viris illustribus

- 73.10 94
 75.11 65

Zonaras

- 8.6.10 300
 8.7 300
 9.22 24, 35

*Inscriptions**Année Épigraphique*

- 1925, 93 210 n. 21
 1934, 84 372
 1936, 1 125 n. 25
 1937, 62 54 n. 72
 1951, 166 350–51
 1969/1970, 89 335
 1978, 288–9 121
 2002, 206 54 n. 72

Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum

- 3.868 336

Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum (CIG)

- 2698b 55

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum

- 1², p. 49 86 n. 53
 1², p. 50 54, 227, 228
 1², p. 64 180
 1², p. 77 72, 73, 323
 1², p. 341 51
 1².709 52 n. 58, 114, 154
 1².1537 120
 1².2.2662 261
 2.2782 330 n. 267
 2.2822 330 n. 267
 3.7394 337
 4.7304a 350
 4.7305b 350
 4.7305c 350
 4.7308a 350
 4.7308b 350
 6.1501 303
 6.11748 136
 6.31587 279
 6.33291 125

6.33325	125	11.4818	319
6.33289	125	11.4880	319
6.33290	125	11.4852	319
8.979	222	11.4902	319
8.5354	293	11.4935	319
8.17492	293	11.4988	318
9.338	351	11.5029	309
9.414	319, 329	11.5219	305
9.2121	351	11.5220	305
9.2450-3	121 n. 20	11.5621	295
9.2806	125	11.5802	297, 380
9.3429	125	11.5820	308
9.3500	125	11.7870	319
9.3587	125	11.7883	319
9.4119	295	11.8113.08	351
9.4348	329 n. 254	13.5201	337
9.4398	295	15.353	319
9.4400	295		
9.4543	295	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae (IG)</i>	
9.4547	295	2 ² 4230	136
9.4549	295	2 ² 4231	136
9.4883	295	2 ² 4330	131
9.4891	295	2 ² 4381	131
9.4896	295	2 ² 5179	136, 353
9.4897	295	12 Suppl. 60	371
9.4899	295		
9.4990	318	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas</i>	
9.4992	318	<i>Pertinentes (IGRRP)</i>	
9.5067	299	3.950	319
10.827	338	4.232	319
10.1468	319		
10.1781	121	<i>Inscriptiones Italiae (Inscr.It.)</i>	
10.3387	116	13.1.72-3	280, 302
10.4805	121	13.1.86-7	135, 136
10.5399	351	13.1.565	158
10.6895	335		
10.6897	335	<i>Inscriptiones Latinae selectae (ILS)</i>	
10.6899-901	335	1	279
11, p. 496-7	287	37	261
11, p. 812-13	285	157	273, 293
11, p. 823	297	881	147, 217
11, p. 853	297	885	329 n. 251
11.2144	127	887	217
11.4170	273, 293	889	322
11.4213	305	893a	318, 323, 327, 329
11.4646	308	894	323
11.4650	308	907	20
11.4654	308	925	322, 329, 381
11.4748	289	932	329 n. 251
11.4772	319, 322, 382	947	329
11.4786	319	972	319
11.4795	319	992	323
11.4800	315	1084	293
11.4804	317	1093	337
11.4806	319	2230	308
11.4812	318	2231	308

Inscriptiones Latinae selectae (ILS) (cont.)

2836 116
 2988 191, 233
 4041 53 n. 64
 5283 116
 5346 329
 5432–5 210
 5531 308
 5666 295
 5671 329
 5738 120
 6204 180
 6384 338
 6526 329
 6550 295
 6629 305
 7385 139
 8768 82 n. 19
 8885 227
 8888 94
 8891 223
 9338 136
 9368 329 n. 254
 9411–12 116
 9461 131
 9491 177 n. 29

*Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*³ (SIG³)

601 325 n. 228
 745 82 n. 19
 747 82, 138 n. 9
 748 184, 366

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (SEG)

30.433 354
 51.1092 355

*Vetter, Handbuch der italischen**Dialekte*

230 274
 234 295
 239, VIb 54–9 273
 239, VIIa 12, 47–8 272

Papyri*Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum (CPL)*

133 163 n. 14

Coins*Roman Republican Coinage*

245 50 n. 43
 284 182 n. 4
 329 177
 351 83
 359 193
 359/1 369
 363 52, 53
 365 82
 450–1 177
 480/2–3 195
 500–1 50 n. 43
 511 325